

Lucan's Caesar at Troy

Otto Zwierlein¹

At the end of Book 7 the reader of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* temporarily loses sight of Caesar. He had most recently encountered him in the guise of the victor of Pharsalos, who greedily surveys the bloodstained battlefield, feasts his eyes on the piles of corpses, refuses to miss this spectacle even while eating, and denies fire to the pyre in his unslaked anger that fellow citizens are concerned (786 ff.). Book 8 is entirely dominated by Pompey; the poet depicts his flight stage by stage and ends with his heroic death off Egypt. At the beginning of Book 9, Cato inherits Pompey's mantle, gathering the republican troops in North Africa, and leads them on a march through the desert in which in a chain of ever-increasing dangers he maintains his superhuman and heroic *virtus*, finally reaching winter quarters at Lepcis.

Here, in the last 150 lines of Book 9, Lucan once more picks up the thread of Caesar's actions, as he pursues Pompey first by land, then by sea. He breaks his journey in Troy. The Trojan extract falls into three parts:² (i) 961–79, Caesar visits the ruins of Troy; (ii) 980–6, Lucan promises himself, his work, and thereby also Caesar eternal fame; (iii) 987–99, Caesar sacrifices to the Phrygian deities and vows to refound Troy if they grant him success.

¹ Originally published as: 'Lucans Caesar in Troia', in *Hermes*, 114 (1986), 460–78. A lightly revised version of a paper given on 7 Mar. 1986 to the Oxford Philological Society. Translated by Leofranc Holdford-Strevens.

² I crave the reader's understanding for my forbearing to quote the passage on grounds of space.

Scholars disagree on the meaning of this Trojan scene: some find its position in the structure of the epic problematic³ (there are even those who wish to detach the middle section, vv. 980–6, from Book 9 and assign them to the preface),⁴ some have difficulties in establishing the point of the passage: is the presentation and evaluation of Caesar favourable, unfavourable, or ambivalent?⁵

A radical solution of the problem is proposed by J. Ciechanowicz in the most recent discussion:⁶ he interprets the 'Trojan Excursus' as a panegyric 'fragment'⁷ written at the same time as the eulogy of Nero while Lucan still enjoyed his favour. He argues that the apostrophe 'Caesar' in 9. 982 is addressed not to Caesar, but as at 1. 41 to Nero. Later, after the breach with the emperor, Lucan no longer wished to incorporate the Trojan episode in Book 9, but, after his death, his editors mechanically inserted the fragment into his work at the point indicated by chronology.

Ciechanowicz's interpretation of the apostrophe is influenced by Ahl's translation of v. 982 ('invidia sacrae, Caesar, ne tangere famae') as 'Caesar, do not be envious of the poet's holy fame';⁸ he has no doubt that poetic fame is at issue, but does not see why Caesar should envy Lucan or any other person on this score, nor why in vv. 985–6 ('venturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra | vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aeo' [posterity will read me and you; our Pharsalia will live and we shall be condemned to darkness by no age]) Lucan should wish to make Caesar of all people immortal, though portraying him almost through the work as a negative figure in sombre colours. Both difficulties would disappear if one supposed that not Caesar but Nero was being addressed; on that hypothesis (Ciechanowicz argues), in the Trojan excursus the poet Lucan turns in an apostrophe speaking of poetical matters to the poet Nero, who once upon a time had composed

³ Bastet and Rutz in Durry 1970: 263–4.

⁴ Herrmann, cit. Rutz 1970b: 264.

⁵ Schrempp 1964: 90–1 n. 44; Rutz 1970b: 249; Tasler 1972: 27 ff.; Häussler 1978: 54 ff. It is not clear to me how von Albrecht 1970: 272 takes the scene.

⁶ Ciechanowicz 1982: 265–6. My comments were written before the publication of Lausberg 1985, which treats the passage cursorily, shows no knowledge of Ciechanowicz, and bases its discussion on Zwierlein 1982: 85–102, esp. 98–9. The interpretation there was originally part of the present article, which in outline was drafted by 1978.

⁷ Ciechanowicz 1982: 268, 269 with n. 12, 270 with n. 15, 272 with n. 23, 274–5.

⁸ Ahl 1976: 219.

a poem on Troy. 'Me teque legent' thus means 'my works and yours'—namely, Lucan's *Pharsalia* and Nero's *Troica* (p. 270) and 'Pharsalia nostra' 'the *Battle of Pharsalos*, dedicated to you and written by me' (p. 273); 'invidia sacrae... famae' (9. 982) refers to Nero's envy, attested elsewhere, of Lucan's poetic fame (p. 270), but in what follows Nero is put on a par with Homer and Lucan himself. The poet's intended meaning is: like Homer and Lucan, Nero too will be read by posterity and thus spared the darkness of oblivion (p. 273).

This latest detailed treatment of Lucan's Troy episode may demonstrate pressingly how hard scholars still strive for an adequate understanding of this passage, important as it is for the poet's presentation of Caesar. In what follows I shall not engage with Ciechanowicz point for point, but set out my own interpretation, from which I hope the questionable nature of his theses will emerge of itself. Nevertheless, I should like to make two preliminary observations.

(i) Every reader can see that the vocative 'Caesar' in 1. 41 is addressed to Nero,⁹ for 1.33 introduced a new paragraph containing at its outset the keyword 'Neroni' and going on to deal unambiguously with his future apotheosis. In 9. 982, by contrast, the reader

⁹ See Lucan 1. 33–45:

quod si non aliam venturo fata Neroni
invenere viam magnoque aeterna parantur
regna deis caelumque suo servire Tonanti 35
non nisi saevorum potuit post bella gigantum,
iam nihil, o superi, querimur; scelera ipsa nefasque
hac mercede placent. diros Pharsalia campos
inpleat et Poeni saturantur sanguine manes,
ultima funesta concurrant proelia Munda, 40
his, Caesar, Perusina fames Mutinaeque labores
accedant fatis et quas premit aspera classes
Leucas et ardenti servilia bella sub Aetna,
multum Roma tamen debet civilibus armis
quod tibi res acta est.

[But if the Fates could find no other way for the advent of Nero, and if eternal kingdoms are bought by the gods at great cost, and heaven could serve its Thunderer only after war with the fierce Giants, then we cannot complain, o gods; the crimes themselves and guilt are pleasing with this reward. Even though Pharsalia fill its terrible plains, though the shade of the Carthaginian be sated with blood, though the final battle be joined at Munda with its corpses, though added to these fateful events, Caesar, be the famine in Perusia and the struggles of Mutina, the ships, which rugged Leucas overwhelms, and the slave wars under burning Etna, nevertheless Rome owes much to civil war, because it all was done for you.]

cannot relate the word to Nero, having had to identify 'Caesar' with Julius Caesar throughout the work, apart from the clearly defined eulogy to Nero in the introduction to Book 1, and to take it the same way yet again only a few verses previously at the beginning of the Trojan passage (9. 950). Julius Caesar takes centre stage throughout the excursus, even in the middle section vv. 980–6, which promises survival in the memory of future generations to Lucan's work and with it to his 'hero'.

(ii) Neither the Trojan excursus as a whole, nor any portion of it, is detachable without disrupting the context; it therefore cannot have been mechanically inserted afterwards by the posthumous editors, unless one cares to posit a major revision of the passage.

This brings me to a closer description of the passage's structure and the arrangement of the three sections indicated in the introduction. The middle section only appears to stand outside the context of the action. To be sure it is set off from the narrative by the apostrophe to the 'vatum labor' [task of poets] and to 'Caesar'; but, in its content it is closely related to the first section, and, furthermore, it is tightly linked by keywords with the beginnings of both the first and third sections.

Having in the first section portrayed Caesar as an admirer of the fame of Troy ('famae mirator' (961)) visiting the venerable ancient sites together with Ajax' grave, and the shades that owe much to the poets ('multum debentis vatibus umbras' (963)), in the second Lucan assures him that he need not look enviously on the fame secured for Troy by the poets, for he, a new Homer, will keep the memory of Caesar's exploits alive for all time. Just as the keyword 'vatibus' [poets] in 963 is repeated at 980 and 984, so 'famae' in 961 at 982, and the venerable sites of which 973 had declared 'nullum est sine nomine saxum' [no stone is without a name] come back into view at the beginning of the section, where Lucan continues the narrative with the resumptive verse 'ut ducis implevit visus veneranda vetustas' [when revered antiquity filled the leader's sight] (987). At the same time 'veneranda vetustas' [revered antiquity] refers back to 'invidia sacrae... fama' [envy of the sacred fame] in the middle section.

The first two verses of the latter, which praise the poets' achievement, follow seamlessly on from the first section, marked as it is by the contrast between Troy's total destruction and her enduring fame: although the ruins of Troy are overgrown with trees, brushwood,

and grass, and these trees for their part by now stand feeble and rotten on limp roots—which reinforces the image of frailty—nevertheless, the poet's work keeps the memory of Troy alive and causes it to last. Here Lucan adopts a topic found again and again at Rome from Ennius onwards, the contrast between fame conferred by statues and (funerary) monuments and that by the poet, which perhaps finds its finest expression in Horace's epilogue to Book 3 of the *Odes* ('exegi monumentum aere perennius' [I have finished a monument more lasting than bronze]).¹⁰ If Hector's grave lies hidden under tall grass and only scattered stones remain from the altar of Zeus Herkeios (975 ff.), the same is true of statues and funerary monuments in Ennius (*Ann.* 404–5 Skutsch),¹¹ and the 'monumenta' and pyramids in Horace,¹² all gnawn away by the tooth of time.¹³ As in Ennius, Horace, and others, so in Lucan: only poetry can secure a name in perpetuity.¹⁴

The keyword 'aevum' [age], which in 981 concludes the laudatory address to the 'vatum labor' [task of poets], returns in 986 at the end of the apostrophe to Caesar, thus emphasizing the concept of eternal duration as central to this passage: Caesar ought not to envy Troy her fame, since his own fame too is assured for all ages by Lucan's *Pharsalia*. It is obvious that Caesar's visit to Troy provides a good framework for this programmatic statement: set against the pitiful remains of the renowned city, Homer's and in general the poets' power of making eternal becomes especially striking. The middle section of the Trojan episode is thus not only attached to what precedes by the repetition of significant keywords, but also shown by its relation to the Ennian fame topic to be a meaningful continuation of the first part. This relation to Ennius is possibly supported by the final position of 'Pharsalia nostra' [our Pharsalia], which Otto Skutsch connected with *Ann.* 12–13 'latos per populos res atque

¹⁰ Cf. also Sen. *Ad Polyb.* 18. 2.

¹¹ Cf. Suerbaum 1968: 151 ff., Häusle 1980.

¹² Cf. Suerbaum 1968: 165 ff., 325 ff.

¹³ With Lucan's 'silvae steriles et putres robore trunci' [barren woods and rotting tree-trunks] that bury the dwellings of Assaracus cf. Juvenal's 'sterilis mala robora fici' [evil strength of the barren fig tree] that can destroy an epitaph (10. 142 ff.).

¹⁴ On this topos, see Curtius 1953: 476–7 and 1972: 117 ff.

poemata nostra | clara cluebunt' [my subject and poem will have fame among the peoples wide and far].¹⁵

The positioning of the Trojan episode as a whole at this point of the action is doubly motivated: (i) externally, by the historical facts; and (ii) internally, by the poet's typological design, for at the end of Book 9 and the beginning of Book 10 Lucan makes Caesar a reflection of Alexander.

Historically, Caesar's pursuit of Pompey from Thessaly across the Hellespont to Asia Minor and thence across the sea to Egypt was a given. It was therefore easy to pick out Troy as a station on his route; nevertheless, it is worth noting that no ancient historian attests a visit by Caesar to Troy.¹⁶ Caesar himself reports only (*Civ.* 3. 106. 1) that he spent a few days in Asia Minor and then pursued Pompey to Alexandria. In the cursory accounts of Suetonius (*Jul.* 35), the Livian *Periochae* (112), and Florus there is no mention at all of Asia Minor, which is no surprise given the nature of these works; but it is striking that Strabo, who at 13. 593 had described Alexander's visit to Troy, a little later (13. 594), while emphasizing Caesar's rivalry with Alexander, makes only a general reference to his support for the Trojans, not to a sojourn in the city.¹⁷

Similarly Plutarch, in the parallel life, had described Alexander's visit to Troy at length (see below), but says not a word about any such circumstance in Caesar's case. Instead we read in §48: 'Having reached Asia Minor he liberated the Cnidian as a favour to the myth-collector Theopompus, and to all the inhabitants of Asia Minor he remitted a third of their tribute. When he landed at Alexandria to find Pompey already dead....' Appian too, in his relatively extended account (*BC* 2. 13. 89), does not mention Troy, merely remarking that Caesar granted an amnesty to all Ionians and Aeolians and the other peoples of Asia Minor who sent ambassadors to him; Dio (42. 6) speaks only of a stay in Asia Minor and a relaxation of tribute. Gelzer's disquisition in his *Caesar* on the general's visit to Ilium, 'the city of his heroic ancestor, Aeneas, son of

Aphrodite',¹⁸ can therefore rest on Lucan alone. However, the degree of caution required in exploiting Lucan's epic as a historical source finds exemplary demonstration in the episode of Cicero's *adhortatio* at the beginning of the battle of Pharsalos (7. 62–86), in which he is made the spokesman of Pompey's army even though the historical Cicero never saw Pharsalos.¹⁹

In the conception of the Trojan episode, too, it was not truth to history that was decisive, but the endeavour to represent Caesar as the image of Alexander.²⁰ The choice of model²¹ is indicated above all by the fact that Lucan here ascribes to Caesar (whom in 961 he had introduced as 'famae mirator' [admirer of the fame]) 'invidia... fama', envy at the fame of Troy: Alexander, according to Cicero (*Pro Archia* 24), though he had numerous writers in his train, exclaimed before Achilles' tomb in Troy: 'O fortunate youth, who found in Homer the herald of your merit!' ('o fortunate adulescens, qui tuae virtutis Homerum praeconem inveneris!'; cf. *Sil.* 13. 796–7). And Cicero concurs, for without the *Iliad* the same burial mound that covers his body would also have buried his name.

There is a similar narrative in Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Alexander Romance* (1. 42. 6–7), that Alexander sacrificed in Troy to Hector and the other heroes. When he saw that the river Scamander, into which Achilles had leapt, was not so much as five cubits wide, and that Ajax' shield of seven hides was nowhere near as large and wonderful as Homer had described it, he exclaimed: 'Happy are you who found in Homer such a herald: for in his poems you have attained a great figure, but in reality you are not worthy of your representation'. A poet approached him and said: 'Alexander, we shall make something greater than Homer', to which Alexander answered: 'I wish to be Homer's Thersites rather than your Agamemnon' (βούλομαι παρ' Ὀμήρου Θερσίτης εἶναι ἢ παρὰ σοὶ Ἀγαμέμνων). According to Porphyrio and

¹⁸ Gelzer 1968: 244; cf. most recently Bradford 1984: 164.

¹⁹ Rambaud 1955: 264; Malcovati 1953; Rutz 1970b: 245.

²⁰ So that he could portray Cato as the opposite of Alexander, in the middle of book 9, Lucan cheerfully ignored the historical and geographical facts, for example, displacing the temple of Ammon to western Libya, cf. Syndikus 1958: 36; Vögler 1968: 247–8. On the influence of the traits established for Alexander in the rhetorical *exempla* tradition cf. Rutz 1970b: 235 ff.; Ahl 1976: 257 ff., 263, 267, 271 ff.

²¹ A few brief hints in Bilinski 1947: 113–14; Syndikus 1958: 66–7, 118; Schönberger 1961, 178, 180; Rutz 1970b: 249.

¹⁵ 1944; for further discussion of this fragment, see Suerbaum 1968: 107 ff.; Zwierlein 1982: 87 ff.; and most recently Skutsch's commentary (1985), 167–8 (cf. 12).

¹⁶ Cf. Burman in Francken's commentary (1896–7) on 9. 998; Syndikus 1958: 66–7; Mayer 1981: 3 (none of whom gives further details).

¹⁷ On Caesar's attachment to Troy, see Weinstock 1971: 5, 16 ff., 23.

Pseudacron on Hor. *ars* 357 it was the poet Choerilus, 'cui Alexander dixisse fertur, malle se (multum malle se *Porphyrio*) Thersiten Homeri esse quam huius Achillem' [to whom Alexander is said to have said that he preferred (much preferred) to be Homer's Thersites than his Achilles].

Caesar's envy at the glorious name of Troy, which Homer's poetry has placed in all men's mouths even though the Xanthus is now a mere trickle and the other places he sang of have long since fallen into ruin, overgrown with grass and brushwood, is modelled on Alexander's yearning, faced with the discrepancy between the real and the Homeric size of the Scamander and Ajax' shield, to have this very Homer for the herald of his own achievements. But, Caesar's attitude is judged more negatively if we observe the opposition 'invidia sacrae...famae' [envy of the sacred fame] and consider that the same phrase 'invidia tangi' [to be touched by envy] recurs in 1052, where Caesar is said to begrudge Ptolemy Pompey's murder. Just as the poets in Alexander's train undertook to represent his exploits more sublimely than Homer, so Lucan promises Caesar that his *Pharsalia* will assure Caesar's fame for as long as Homer's name is honoured.²²

At Troy, Lucan's Caesar also appears to be following in Alexander's footsteps in that, like a tourist, with a native guide ('monstrator' (979)) at that, he wanders through the places laden with myth and history. To be sure, a romantic and sentimental interest in antiquities is typical of the imperial period; think, for example, of Statius' *Silvae* or of Silius, who purchased a country estate that had belonged to Cicero and Vergil's grave,²³ and in Book 12 of the *Punica* (vv. 113–57) makes Hannibal, accompanied by the civic dignitaries, visit the Old City of Capua and in particular the grave of Misenus, Aeneas' trumpeter.²⁴ Indeed, Lucan himself returns to this theme several times in his poem.²⁵ But even Alexander, according to Plutarch, not only sacrificed in Troy to Athena, made offerings to the heroes'

²² Aware of Roman poetry's increased power ('si quid Latiis fas est promittere Musis' [If it is allowed for Latin Muses to promise anything]) he compares himself with Homer, just as in turn he is soon placed beside Homer in Statius' famous 'genethliacon' (*Silv.* 2. 7. 33 ff.).

²³ See Sherwin-White 1985 on Plin. *epist.* 3. 7. 8.

²⁴ Cf. Norden 1903 on *Aen.* 6. 179–80.

²⁵ Besides Caesar's tour of Alexandria, to be considered next, cf. 4. 589 ff., 659–60 (Curio in Africa); 8. 112 ff., 820 ff., 851 ff., 869 ff.; 9. 42–3; 10. 175 ff., 184.

graves, anointed Achilles' gravestone with oil, ran up it to naked, as was the custom, and placed a garland on top of it, but also walked about in the city and saw the sights.²⁶ Plutarch's ἐν δὲ τῷ περιεῖναι καὶ θεᾶσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν [while going around and viewing the sights of the city] matches Lucan's 'circumit exustae nomen memorabile Troiae' [he goes around a memorable name, burnt down Troy] (9. 964)—and the verb returns at the beginning of Book 10 (v. 17), where we accompany Caesar on his tour of Alexandria, which leads him past the pylons, venerable temples, and city walls to Alexander's mausoleum. Here the poet sets up a direct encounter between Caesar and his prototype.²⁷ If he makes the mirroring by Caesar's stay in Troy of the famous visit there by Alexander only indirect, so that only the knowledgeable reader can follow it, he makes this typological reference to the great conqueror obvious, when his hero for his own part visits Alexander's grave as once Alexander had visited that of Achilles.

The recognition that Lucan has fashioned his Caesar as a mirror image of Alexander brings us an important step forward in our quest for the direction of the Troy scene. If Caesar bears the traits of Alexander and indeed by visiting his grave appears as his heir and successor, Lucan's promise in 9. 982 ff. to ensure his perpetual memory cannot be understood as a laudatory encomium. For, Alexander was for Lucan and his contemporaries, influenced by Stoic popular philosophy and by declamations (take, for example, the philosopher Seneca) the paradigm of the uncontrollable, 'furor'-led, plundering despot.²⁸ Sure enough, Lucan also calls him 'Pellaei proles

²⁶ The historic sites of Troy are known as a tourist attraction from other sources: W. Slater (McMaster University) refers me to Polemon fr. 32 Preller, who reports that in his day (180 bc) visitors to Ilium were shown the stone on which Palamedes had played *pettoi*, and to the epigram *AP* 7. 564, probably composed by the proconsul Quintilius Maximus c. AD 165, when he restored the completely ruined monument of Priam's daughter Laodice, who at the fall of Troy, according to legend, fleeing from the Greeks, was swallowed up by the earth, which opened up to receive her, and also replaced on it the bronze statue of her, which was lying neglected some way off (see Cichorius 1922: 374). D. A. Russell recalls Dio Chrysostom's Trojan oration (*Or.* 11). For the influence of periegetic literature on Lucan here, see Bilinski 1947: 93–4.

²⁷ Its historicity is questionable: Lucan probably transferred Augustus' tour of the city to Caesar. Cf. Vogler 1968: 248, who refers to Christensen 1909: 122 n. 2 and Hoffmann 1907: 56 n. 5. Cf. also Syndikus 1968: 66, Rutz 1970b: 249, and Ahl 1976: 222 ff. The whole scene has lately been treated in detail by Schmidt 1986.

²⁸ Cf. Christensen 1909: 123 ff.; Hoffmann 1907: 50 ff.; Morford 1967: 12–19; Marti 1970: 115–16; Rutz 1970b: 250; further Stroux 1933; Heuss 1954; Tandoi 1963: 88;

vaesana Philippi' [the mad offspring of Pellaeon Philip] (10. 20), 'vaesanus rex' [mad king] (10. 42) and 'felix praedo', a successful robber, whose ashes ought to have been scattered over the entire earth (10. 21–2). He characterizes him in very similar terms to the Roman 'Imperator': the keywords 'rabies' [rabid frenzy], 'vaesanus' [mad], and 'furens' [raging] also appear in the context of Caesar (e.g., 7. 245, 496, 551, 797); as Alexander 'humana cum strage ruit gladiumque per omnes | exegit gentes' [amid human ruin rushed on and drove his sword through all nations] (10. 31–2), so Caesar 'dat stragem late' [spreads ruin far and wide] (1. 157) or 'in arma furens nullas nisi sanguine fuso | gaudet habere vias' [mad for war, rejoices to move forward only by shedding blood] (2. 439–40), is obsessively determined 'numquam temerando parcere ferro' [always to draw his sword rashly] (1. 147), and rejoices 'viam fecisse ruina' [to make his way by destruction] (1. 150); as Alexander is compared to a bolt of lightning, a 'fulmen, quod omnis | percuteret pariter populos' [lightning, which struck all the peoples equally] (10. 34–5), so is Caesar in 1. 151 ff.: 'qualiter... fulmen... emicuit... populosque pautes | teruit' [just as lightning flashes out and strikes terror in the panicked people.]

When such a Caesar, who shortly after his brief visit to Troy at the end of Book 9 hypocritically weeps at the spectacle of his son-in-law's severed head, in order to conceal his joy,²⁹ at the beginning of Book 10 seeks out the grave of Alexander, whom all lovers of freedom hate, Lucan means thus to illustrate Caesar's affinity to Alexander: the new despot, who is enslaving Rome and the world, should be seen as the spiritual descendant of the prototype for all despotism, who fulfils the testament of his model, the subjugation of the peoples, for his time, and passes it on to his successors.

It is in the light of this scene, Caesar's direct encounter with Alexander, that the Trojan episode, in which Caesar, as has been shown, follows in the footsteps of Alexander, must be interpreted. It hands us the key to resolving the apparent contradiction between

Lucan's condemnation of Caesar in the rest of his poem and his offer to guarantee his fame.

A second key is Lucan's transformation of Vergil's Aeneas and Evander scene, a relationship already in part discovered by Thompson and Bruère.³⁰ After Aeneas has joined in celebrating the sacrifice in Hercules' honour (8. 172 ff., 276 ff.), he returns to the city walking beside Evander, who is accompanied by his son Pallas. In doing so, he lets his eyes wander round in astonishment; he enquires after, and with rejoicing heart hears, the traditions of the past. Evander shows him the altar and gate of the seeress Carmenta, the immense grove that Romulus made into the Asylum, the Lupercal in its cool grotto, the Tarpeian rock and the Capitol, at that time still overgrown by forest brushwood; lastly, two fortresses with tumbledown walls, the Janiculum and the Saturnia, survivors and reminders of bygone times.

This walk through Pallanteum, the nucleus of the future Rome, should be borne in mind as we accompany Caesar through the ruins of Troy. Just as Aeneas (*Aen.* 8. 310) 'miratur facilisque oculos fert omnia circum' [admires and casts his ready eyes all around], so Caesar comes as 'famae mirator' [admirer of fame] (961) to Troy and 'circumit exustae nomen memorabile Troiae' [goes around a memorable name, burnt down Troy] (964); Aeneas is shown ('monstrat', 337, 345) the various memorable sites by Evander; Caesar has a native Phrygian (976) as 'monstrator' [guide] (979); the future Capitol, as Aeneas visited it, was still 'silvestribus horrida dumis' [bristling with woodland thickets] (348), the ruins of Troy are buried under brushwood and grass ('teguntur... dumetis'); to the remnants of the Janiculum and Saturnia with their tumbledown walls ('disiectis... muris' (355)) correspond in Lucan the 'vestigia Phoebæi muri' [traces of the wall of Phoebus] (965) and the 'discussa saxa' [scattered stones] of Zeus' altar (978–9). At the same time, this altar of Zeus Herkeios has its Vergilian counterpart in the altar of the prophetess Carmenta.

The altar of Carmenta, by contrast, is undamaged; the explanatory addition that the nymph Carmenta was the first to prophesy the future greatness of the Aeneadae and the glorious city on the Palatine gives us a glimpse of the fated and auspicious mission of Rome. Contrariwise, the scattered stones of Zeus' altar, which no longer

further literature now in Lausberg 1985: 1584 n. 79, whose interpretation, following Lebek 1976 and Ahl 1976: 238, also fruitfully exploits Caesar's relation to the Homeric Achilles (1583 ff. with n. 86). Cf. also Seibert 1981: 24 ff. (240), 217 ff.

²⁹ On this episode, see most recently Tschiedel 1985.

³⁰ Thompson and Bruère 1968: 16 ff.

exhibit the slightest sign of a cult object, are the symbol—linked to the memory of a sinful misdeed—of the total fall of Troy. Whereas Aeneas as Evander's guest encounters the 'bucolic' proto-Rome,³¹ whose future destiny, to bring order to the world and guide it in peace, is already prefigured in its original state, in the cult of Hercules as subduer of Cacus and the reminiscence of Saturn's 'aurea saecula' [golden age], who in this place governed the descendants of a harsh race in gentle peace (324–5), Caesar stands before the sad remains of a city that has its once glorious history long behind it. And, whereas Aeneas as Evander's guest is enveloped by the breath of pious veneration (172 ff., 276 ff., 349 ff., 362 ff., 541 ff.) and with rejoicing heart ('laetus' (311)) enquires and learns about the traditions of the past, Lucan's Caesar crosses the Scamander 'inscius' [unwittingly] (974), sets foot on the grass 'securus' [oblivious], so that the Phrygian has to stop him from treading on Hector's grave: 'manes | Hectoreos calcare' (975), an expression that we may probably link to the reference, some seventy verses later, to the unfeeling cruelty with which Caesar 'duro membra senatus | calcarat voltu' [he, with cruel face, had trampled on the senate's limbs] (9. 1043–4), a motif that Caesar himself had employed in his speech before Pharsalos: 'videor fluvios spectare cruoris | calcatosque simul reges sparsumque senatus | corpus' [I seem to look at streams of blood | and kings trampled on together and the scattered | body of the senate] (7. 293 ff.). Finally, the guide rebukes Caesar for not noticing the altar of Zeus (979), and the poet accuses him of 'invidia sacrae . . . famae' [envy of the sacred fame] (982): this Caesar of Lucan's seems a clear opposite of Aeneas.

This may also be seen in the sequel; for, when this Caesar immediately afterwards introduces himself as a descendant of Aeneas (991) and as the most glorious scion of the Julian race (995), it is precisely through the comparison with Aeneas that the reader will perceive how questionable are the glorious deeds that lie behind the self-awarded title 'clarissimus . . . nepos' [most illustrious descendant],³² and no doubt remember that in Book 6 Lucan had devalued in advance a similar self-description by Sex. Pompeius with his own judgement: for, whereas at 6. 593–4 Sextus presents himself as 'non

ultima turbae | pars ego Romanae, Magni clarissima proles' [not the lowest part of the Roman crowd, but the most illustrious son of Magnus], four lines earlier Lucan had introduced him as 'Pompei ignava propago' [Pompey's cowardly offspring] (6. 589).³³

It follows that when Caesar in 990 ff. sacrifices to the divinities who inhabit the Phrygian ruins, and the Phrygian divinities whom Aeneas brought to Rome, and promises them to restore their people if they will vouchsafe him success in his further career, the reader will detect a double antithesis to Aeneas: (i) as he continues to compare Lucan's Trojan episode with Vergil's Pallanteum scene, he will measure Caesar's prayer, governed by the achievement of personal ambitions, against the solemn thank-offering of Evander and Aeneas to Hercules (172 ff., 276 ff., 541 ff.); (ii) in the degenerate Aeneas's vow he will see the perversion of Aeneas' successful mission: while Vergil's Aeneas saves the Phrygian divinities for the new Roman Troy, brings back to life the remnants of the Saturnian Golden Age from the ruins under which they lie buried, and creates the nucleus for the Golden Age of the Augustan reign of peace, Lucan's Caesar becomes, through that very success in the civil war that he makes here the condition for his refoundation of Troy, the destroyer of Rome, who sets the seal on the city's enslavement for many generations and casts the once flourishing commonwealth into precisely that state of ruin in which he sees Troy, the germ-cell of Rome, lying here.³⁴

The prayer for 'felices in cetera cursus' [a successful course for the future] (997) will remind the reader of the trail of blood that Caesar's 'fortunate course' has left behind it up to now,³⁵ the course of a commander whom it irks 'concessa . . . ire via' (2. 446), to take the path left open for him, who 'in arma furens nullas nisi sanguine fuso | gaudet habere vias' [mad for war, rejoices to move forward only by shedding blood] (2. 439–40) and 'patriae per viscera vadit' [walks through the fatherland's guts] (7. 722): Caesar's 'cursus' are 'felices' in the same sense as Alexander is called 'felix praedo' [a successful robber],

³³ Cf. 6. 420 'Sextus . . . Magno proles indigna parente' [Sextus, the unworthy offspring of his father Magnus].

³⁴ In 3. 211 ff. Troy appears as an omen of defeat.

³⁵ The sarcasm is all the more marked in that 'date felices in cetera cursus' [grant a successful course for the future] recalls to aural memory Vergil's prayer to Augustus 'da facilem cursum' [grant an easy course] (*Georg.* 1. 40).

³¹ A penetrating interpretation in Klingner 1967: 532 ff.; cf. further George 1974.

³² On this topic, cf. Ahl 1976: 209–10 (but his view of Aeneas as portrayed in Vergil needs correction).

and as the poet makes an aged Roman citizen, after a detailed depiction of the atrocities committed by Sulla's troops in the city, enquire with biting sarcasm (2. 221–2): 'hisne salus rerum, *felix* his Sulla vocari, | his meruit tumulum medio sibi tollere Campo?'³⁶ [For this did Sulla deserve to be called Saviour of the State, or Successful, for this to raise his tomb in the middle of the Campus?].

It is the emphasis with which Caesar links himself in 9. 991 to Aeneas—'Aeneaeque mei . . . lares' [and household gods of my Aeneas] is the only mention in the entire poem of Aeneas' name (Ahl, p. 221)—that makes manifest the difference from the real Aeneas, who throughout the whole Trojan scene is constantly present as a foil.

In making this assessment we should not be led astray by Caesar's words about himself: 'dat pia tura nepos' [the descendant offers incense due to you] (996) and 'rite vocat' [he solemnly calls upon you] (997). It is 'rite', 'in accordance with cultic ritual', 'observing the usual ceremonies', that Caesar is made by Lucan to address the gods of crime and the Eumenides in the poet's question before the battle of Pharsalos: 'at tu quos scelerum superos, quas rite vocasti | Eumenidas, Caesar?' [But, you, Caesar, what gods of wickedness, what Furies did you solemnly invoke?] (7. 168–9). The poet continues: 'To what demons of the Stygian realm, underworld horrors, and night-sunk Furies hast thou sacrificed, when about to conduct so mercilessly a wicked war?' To 'impia bella' [wicked war], then, in Lucan's

³⁶ The catalogue of contingents in Pompey's army culminates in the summary (3. 296–7): 'acciperet felix ne non semel omnia Caesar, | vincendum pariter Pharsalia praestitit orbem' [In order that fortunate Caesar might win everything in one go, Pharsalia gave him the world to conquer at once]; and when later Pompey finally abandons the battlefield of Pharsalos, Lucan offers him the following consolation (7. 698 ff.):

nonne iuvat pulsum bellis cessisse nec istud
perspectasse nefas? spumantes caede catervas
respice, turbatos incursu sanguinis amnes
et soceri miserere tui. quo pectore Romam
intrabit factus campis felicior istis? . . .
vincere peius erat.

[Is it not pleasing to have yielded defeated from the war, and not to have witnessed that horror to the end? Look back at the ranks foaming with slaughter, the rivers troubled by the inrush of blood, and take pity on your father-in-law. With what feelings will he enter Rome, made more fortunate at the cost of those fields? . . . Victory was worse].

judgement Caesar summons gods and demons with his ceremonies of sacrifice, and as the man who began the civil war he himself is 'impius' [wicked], as emerges for example from 7. 261 ff., 320–2 ('non vos pietatis imago | ulla nec . . . parentes | commoveant' [let no image of piety or parents shake you]), 503, 551, 557 ff., 574 ff.; in 8. 783 he is expressly called 'Magni socer impius' [the wicked father-in-law of Magnus], thus here too the opposite of 'pius Aeneas'.³⁷

When this Caesar, in a ceremonial sacrifice in Troy, invokes the gods, it is plainly with the aim of making them serve his selfish goals; and even before the prayer begins Lucan has anticipated the outcome (9. 989): his prayer will be heard, Caesar will continue successfully on his way, which will be drenched in the blood of Pompey, in the blood of further legions of fellow citizens, and finally in the blood of the last guarantor of freedom, Cato. Lucan's 'votaque turicremos non irrita fudit in ignes' [he poured into the incense-burning flames prayers not unfulfilled] (989) is accordingly to be taken as a sarcastic observation, matching the role that the gods play from the outset in this work, from the famous line 'victrix causa deis placuit sed victa Catoni' [The conquering cause pleased the gods, but the conquered pleased Cato] (1. 128; cf. 7. 349), by way of the resigned maxim 'servat multos fortuna nocentis | et tantum miseris irasci numina possunt' [Fortune keeps safe many guilty men, and the gods can only take out their anger on the unlucky] (3. 448–9), to the despairing cry in Book 7: 'sunt nobis nulla profecto | numina: cum caeco rapiantur saecula casu, | mentimur regnare Iovem' [Truly gods do not exist for us; when the world is swept along by blind chance, we falsely say that

³⁷ Caesar's assurance to the gods that he offers 'pia tura' [incense due to you] is therefore dishonest. This tendency to hypocrisy seems characteristic of Lucan's Caesar elsewhere too, perhaps most clearly in his shedding of crocodile tears at the sight of his opponent's severed head (9. 1035 ff.), where Lucan explicitly confirms a false 'pietas' (1055–6), whereas Caesar pretends to address 'voces . . . pias' [pious words] to Pompey's ghost (1094–5), and then lies manfully without convincing the bystanders (1102 ff.; so already 1062–3). Here too belong 10. 14 and above all the deceitful address to the soldiers before Pharsalos (7. 264 ff.); also 1. 349 ff.; 3. 142–3, 356–7. Even the tyrant's subordinates are compelled to be hypocrites: for example, 1. 257 ff.; 2. 40 ff.; 5. 385 ff.; 7. 40 ff.; 9. 1104 ff. Significant for assessing Caesar's prayers is Pompey's 7. 113 'vincis apud superos votis me, Caesar, iniquis' [you, Caesar, prevail over me among the gods with unjust prayers].

Jupiter reigns] (7. 445 ff.); 'mortalia nulli | sunt curata deo' [Mortal affairs have not been a concern to any god] (7. 454–5).³⁸

Caesar's prayer in Troy is as self-seeking, concerned only with his own success, as the related prayer by the Rubicon in Book 1, in which he assures the goddess Roma, who has physically manifested herself, pleading with him to halt, that he will not be an enemy to Rome so long as he is allowed to remain Rome's soldier, victorious by sea and land; whoever hinders him in that bears the blame should he become Rome's foe (1. 195 ff.). That is, he sets his personal circumstances above those of Rome, seeking to dictate to the goddess his conditions for the city's preservation even when he appears to beg for the Roman gods' blessing on his enterprise. The prayer-formula 'fave coeptis' [favour my undertaking] (200) must sound to the reader as sheer mockery: although in itself it belongs to the ritual for founding a city, it is uttered here as the prelude to the destruction of Rome in the civil war.³⁹ At the same time, Lucan wishes to bring out the paradox that it is above all the protective deities of Rome, brought by Aeneas from Troy, who are invoked by a descendant of Aeneas determined if need

³⁸ Throughout the work the gods are hostile to republican Rome: 1. 262 ff.; 2. 1, 44, 288, 304–5 (566 ff.); 3. 392 ff.; (4. 254 ff.); 4. 351–2, 807 ff.; 5. 293–4, 481–2, 499, 537; 7. 85–6, 88–9, 113, 297–8, 339, 647–8; 8. 55, 93–4, 486–7; 9. 65–6, 187–8; 10. 414–15, 485.

³⁹ Morford 1967: 78. On the other hand, Pompey can adopt the same formula in consulting the Senate at Syhedra (8. 322) with inherent justification. His proposal is to march east (8. 289 ff.) and gather round him the troops of the eastern kingdoms, which are well disposed to him. That would mean that Caesar had to fight Medes, and consequently Rome to conduct her civil war against Parthians and thus in any case obtain a victory, by avenging either Pompey (on the close link between Rome and Pompey cf. 7. 138 'urbi Magnoque timetur' [there is fear for the city and Pompey]) or the two Crassi (if Caesar should defeat the Parthians). Thus, the civil war would paradoxically achieve what Lucan at the start of the poem had called for as the desirable alternative to civil war, that Romans' might should be directed against foreign peoples, esp. against the Parthians, to avenge Rome's shame (cf. 1. 8 ff.; 2. 45 ff.; 7. 431; 10. 47 ff.). For such an enterprise Pompey can rightly beg for Rome's favour. In a sense this inverts Caesar's speech on entering Rome (3. 90 ff.), but that Lucan is more concerned with the rhetorical effective and precious pointing of an idea is shown by 8. 237–8, where Pompey adjures the Parthians: 'Pompeio vincite, Parthi: | vinci Roma volet' [Conquer for Pompey, Parthians, and Rome will want to be conquered]. Cf. also Lentulus' speech in 8. 331 ff., esp. 428 ff. 'et si Thessalia bellum civile peractum est, | ad Parthos qui vicit eat: gens unica mundi est, | de qua Caesareis possim gaudere triumphis' [And if by Pharsalia the civil war was decided, let the victor go to the Parthians. They are the one nation in Caesar's triumph over which I could rejoice].

be to sacrifice even the existence of this Roman fatherland to his personal ambitions.⁴⁰

Consequently, Lucan next, when Caesar has decided to cross the river and place his foot on the 'vetita... arva Hesperiae' [forbidden fields of Hesperia], as the poet puts it (1. 224), reveals the *Imperator's* true mind when he makes him exclaim: 'Here, at this place, I leave peace and law (which I have already violated)⁴¹ behind me; thee, Fortune, do I follow; away now with treaties! I have put my cause in the hands of Fate: war shall decide'. This is in harmony with Caesar's speech before the battle of Pharsalos, in which (7. 253 ff.) he declares to his soldiers that this is the day that they had promised him by the Rubicon, the day that shall show before the eyes of Fate who has taken up arms with greater right;⁴² this battle will lay the guilt on the loser. If they have attacked their fatherland with fire and sword on his behalf, they must now fight full of rage and redeem their guilt with the sword: none of them will have clean hands, if the judge of the war is changed (that is, the office of judge is transferred from Caesar to a victorious Pompey).

Caesar's prayer by the Rubicon thus demonstrates to the gods and above all Roma so great a determination to procure his own advantage that the reader—especially as the scene continues—easily grasps the poet's intention to characterize him as a man who seeks to impose his own will even on the gods—'successus urguere suos, instare favori | numinis, inpellens quidquid sibi summa petenti | obstaret' [he followed

⁴⁰ So I take it (cf. Ahl 1976: 211) against Grimal 1970: 57–8, Tasler 1971: 20–1, and others, who in my opinion fail to recognize that the sentence 'non te furialibus armis | persequor' [I do not attack you with the weapons of a public enemy] is to be seen in a close antithetical relationship to 203 'ille erit ille nocens, qui te tibi fecerit hostem' [He, he will be guilty, who has made me your enemy]. Caesar thus says, that his arms are not primarily directed against Rome (if only he were allowed, he will gladly even now fight for Rome), but against the man who compels him to maintain his position of power by turning against Rome—which makes no difference to the result.

⁴¹ I adopt the interpretation of 'temerata' by Grimal 1970: 64.

⁴² I would include this sentence ('haec, fato quae teste probet, quis iustius arma | sumpserit' [this (is the day) which is to decide with fate as a witness, who took up arms more justly]) amongst the arguments against Housman's intervention in 1. 227 ('satis his' [(we have put our trust) in these (pacts) long enough]), where we must follow the paradoxos: 'credidimus fatis: utendum iudice bello' [We have put our trust in the fates, war must be used as a judge]. The perfect 'credidimus' should be referred not to a previous decision on Caesar's part (Lebek 1976: 122 n. 25), but to that just taken (resultative perfect).

up his own successes, pressed hard on the favour of the deity, overthrowing whatever stood in the way of his high ambitions] was how, a few verses previously, Lucan had introduced him (1. 148 ff.).⁴³ The same trait appears in the prayer he addresses to a partly overlapping list of deities in Troy.

What indeed, apart from the prayer for 'felices cursus' [a successful course] already elucidated, are we to make of the promise to rebuild Troy and create a new Trojan people? Is Caesar of all people to renew the population of Troy? That, too, is pure scorn, if one recalls how during the battle of Pharsalos he had incited his troops to ruthless combat against their fellow citizens (7. 550 ff.) and above all got them to massacre the senators, the vital artery of empire, the organs of the state:

The nobility and with it the knights, venerable figures, were assailed with steel; Lepidi and Metelli are slain, with Corvini and esteemed Torquati, men who had often governed the state and occupied the leading places after Pompey... Here the whole pride of the fatherland met its end: piled in heaps lay corpses of patricians on the battlefield with no commoners amongst them. (581–5, 597–8)

So, the destroyer of Rome vows to raise a Roman Troy! His tour through the scanty ruins of Troy, extinct and overgrown with grass and brushwood, symbolizes the fall of Rome, on which he set the seal with the civil war, with Pharsalos. Through him Rome has sunk to precisely that devastation that meets his eyes here in Troy, the origin of Roman history. Lucan makes this connection clear by the related depictions of the ruin wrought by civil war in his passionate reflections at the beginning and end of the battle of Pharsalos (7. 387 ff., 847 ff.); see, for instance, 7. 391 ff. (similarly understood by Ahl, pp. 215–16):

Then shall all the proud name of Latium be mere fable: only with difficulty will Gabii and Veii and Cora be discernible amidst the dusty ruins, likewise the dwellings of Alba and the Penates of Laurentum, empty land and uninhabited... It was not ravenous time that wrecked them and condemned these

⁴³ The notion that the gods' favour can to some extent be compelled or purchased, indeed that the gods are dependent on human good will, seems not alien to Lucan, cf. 7. 113 (see above, n. 36); 4. 122–3; 2. 92–3; 5. 582–3; 2. 651. Caesar's wrath weighs more heavily than the gods' (3. 439). The power of the Thessalian witches over the 'superi' is portrayed at 6. 492 ff. Kings silence the unwelcome voices of the gods at the oracles (5. 111 ff.).

historic monuments to fall down; it is the guilt of civil war that appears before our eyes in all these abandoned cities.⁴⁴

These are the same laments over civil war that he had uttered in his proem (1. 24 ff.):

That now by contrast the houses in the Italian cities threaten to collapse under half-shattered roofs, giant stones from fallen walls lie on the ground, no guardian lives in the homes and the few inhabitants wander lost in venerable cities, that Hesperia is stiff with undergrowth and has not been farmed for many years, that the hands are not there though the fields call for them.

All this is the result of the civil wars (cf., too, 5. 403–4). If, then, the cause of this degradation now promises to build 'Romana Pergama' [Roman Pergamum], it is the poet's intention, by means of the contrast between this promise and the true effect of Caesar's conduct, to cast a baleful light on this man's real character.

In the closing verses of Caesar's prayer, too, the Roman reader must have heard once again the impious arrogance of wishing to set one's own will above that of the Olympians: it was the will of Fate that Aeneas should found for the Phrygian Penates a new homeland in Rome, which would rise to become mistress of the world. Troy must be extinguished once and for all: 'occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia' [Troy has fallen, and let it stay fallen together with its name] Juno had demanded at *Aen.* 12. 828,⁴⁵ and Jupiter had granted it her. In Horace (*carm.* 3. 3. 18 ff.), Juno had expressly made it a condition for her concession that Troy should remain destroyed, that the herds should caper on the graves of Priam and Paris, and wild beasts hide their young in safety (40 ff.). She had issued a threat and warning to the Romans that they should not, 'nimium pii rebusque fidentes', in an excess of devotion and trusting overmuch in their might, rebuild the dwellings of Troy, their ancestral city (57 ff.), and adds

If Troy be born again in despite of evil omen, she shall also repeat her lamentable fall. I myself will lead the troops to victory, I, the consort and sister of Zeus. Though thrice the brazen wall should rise again by Apollo's

⁴⁴ Translation based on Ehlers 1973.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Aen.* 2. 602–3 (both passages cited in Thompson and Bruère 1968: 20–1) and 1. 206.

doing, thrice should it fall, shattered by my Argives, thrice should the captured wife weep for husband and children.

It is this divine decree that Caesar in his arrogance means to transgress. He annexes the mission of Aeneas, which was directed to building 'altera Troia' [a second Troy] in Latium (*Aen.* 3. 86, 7. 233, 8. 36ff., 10. 27, 74), and perverts it to 'Romana... Pergama' [Roman Pergamum], from which, according to Juno's prophecy, new bloodshed will result. Whether Lucan in these verses is also condemning the plans ascribed to Caesar of transferring the capital to Troy⁴⁶ need not concern us.⁴⁷ In any case, the voices of dismay from contemporaries reported by Nicolaus of Damascus (90 F 130. 68 Jacoby) and Suetonius (*Jul.* 79. 3–4) show that Caesar's promise was bound to repel Lucan's reader and awake unhappy memories—and the view of Caesar that Lucan gives the inhabitants of Troy is plain from 3. 211 ff., where Trojan soldiers flock to Pompey's summons, 'nec fabula Troiae | continuit Phrygiiue ferens se Caesar Iuli' [neither the story of Troy restrained (them) nor Caesar claiming descent from Phrygian Iulus].

We must therefore recognize that even Caesar's sacrifice and prayer in Troy do not cast any favourable light on the *Imperator*, but are meant to illustrate his arrogance and his imperious dealing with the gods.⁴⁸ Precisely by emphasizing in this connection his close genealogical relation to Aeneas he is perceived as a contrasting figure to 'pius Aeneas', the saviour of the Phrygian gods and founder of the new Troy in Latium.

Thus, the third section of the Trojan episode fits well with the first section, discussed above. If Lucan, now in the intervening programmatic part, by analogy with Homer's significance for the survival of

⁴⁶ So Syndikus 1968: 66–7.

⁴⁷ These reports are of course mere rumour, whose alleged reflection in poetry is questioned by Kiessling-Heinze and Fraenkel 1957: 267–8 in their interpretations of Juno's speech in Horace.

⁴⁸ On the gods' role in the poem, see above, nn. 37 and 42. Note also Lucan's sarcastic comment in 5. 400ff. on the 'feriae Latinae' [Latin Festival] celebrated immediately after Caesar's election as consul conducted in servile compliance by the people and parts of the Senate, in which Lucan sees the subjugation of Latium: 'nec non Iliacae numen quod praesidet albae, | haud meritum Latio sollemnia sacra subacto, | vidit flammifera confectas nocte Latinas' [Furthermore, the god who presides over Trojan Alba, undeserving of the customary rites after Latium had been conquered, saw the Latin Festival come to an end with the bonfire at night].

the name of Troy and her heroes, offers to guarantee Caesar's posthumous fame, there can be no doubt that this offer of the poet's is again delivered with abundance of sarcasm. I have stated this briefly in an earlier article,⁴⁹ when I placed Lucan's verses in the tradition of ancient epic poets' promise of fame to their heroes: whereas Ennius is above all concerned with praising the victorious Roman warrior, and Vergil promises eternal fame to the self-sacrificing death of a pair of friends, Lucan certainly alludes to these Vergilian verses in his assurance that he will immortalize Caesar in the memory of posterity, but by the phrase 'Pharsalia nostra vivet' [our Pharsalia will live] makes it clear that unlike Vergil he intends not a glorification of Caesar but a condemnation for all time. The war of Pharsalos, waged by Caesar, portrayed by Lucan, will live for all time in the memory of posterity, that is to say: all the atrocities committed by Caesar and his men on the 'diri campi' [dreadful plains] of Pharsalos and on the way to this most abominable of all civil-war encounters, atrocities that the poet does not tire to portray in the most lurid colours.⁵⁰ These verses, as I showed in the article cited, are stamped with the same cynicism as the eulogy for Curio at the end of Book 4, in which Lucan claims to celebrate the young man with 'digna...meritae praeconia vitae' [a worthy commendation of his deserving life] (813) that culminate in the pointed conclusion: 'emere omnes, hic vendidit urbem' [They all bought Rome, but he sold it] (824)—and they exhibit the same inversion of epic convention as the negatively slanted praise of Scaeva, to whom after his *aristeia* the poet exclaims (6. 262): 'infelix, quanta dominum virtute parasti!' [Unlucky man, with how much courage did you acquire a master!].⁵¹

Lucan self-confidently compares himself with Homer and prophecies for his work as long a life as that of the Smyrnaean poet. But thereby at the same time the charge against Caesar and his criminal

⁴⁹ Zwierlein 1982: 98–9.

⁵⁰ That Lucan even in choosing the phrase 'Pharsalia nostra | vivet' [our Pharsalia will live] reveals the cynical nature of his promise of fame was emphasized in discussion by Gregory Hutchinson: whenever the name appears in the work, it is linked to the representation of sanguinary horrors perpetrated by armies in civil war, cf. esp. 1. 38; 4. 803; 7. 535, 632, 781; 9. 232.

⁵¹ Striking departures from the epic norm are discussed by Lebek 1976: 154–5, 253, 264–5. For examples of Lucan's inversion or contrastive imitation of Vergilian motifs, see now Narducci 1985: 1538–64.

deeds is assured of permanence—and that is the aim of the poem: the destroyer of republican ‘libertas’, who in succession to the ‘*vaesana proles Philippi*’ [mad offspring of Philip] imposes a despotic form on Rome and the world, shall in all time to come be fixed in the memory;⁵² just as on the other side he hopes to secure for Pompey, whom—at least in the later books—he turns into the champion of the Senate and therewith the Republic, the lasting favour of posterity. For, in later generations—as he prophesies in Book 7—reading about the battles at Pharsalos will stimulate a deep inward participation: they will arouse lively hopes and fears and vain wishes and to an extent cause distress, as if they concerned the determination not of a past event, but the whole future dispensation (7. 207–12), and as if what sank at Pharsalos were the freedom not of Rome, but of the whole world for all times (7. 632–46).

⁵² This bias in Lucan’s poem stands in a broad anti-Caesarian tradition. Cf. Strasburger 1968. Those interpreters who invent a contradiction between Lucan’s (exaggerated, but not ironic) encomium on Nero and his condemnation of the tyrant Caesar do not recognize that Nero saw himself as a successor not to Caesar but to the *princeps* [emperor] Augustus and expressly gave respect for the Senate as his programme in the inaugural speech that Seneca composed for him. On the whole problem cf. most recently Griffin 1984: for example, 18 ff., 94–5, 158–9), also Mayer 1981: 3–4.