ONLINE SURVEY

In collaboration with Unglue.it, we have set up a survey (only ten questions!) to learn more about how open access ebooks are discovered and used.

We really value your participation—please take part!

CLICK HERE

An electronic version of this book is freely available, thanks to the support of libraries working with Knowledge Unlatched. KU is a collaborative initiative designed to make high quality books Open Access for the public good.

Anatomizing *Civil War*

Studies in Lucan's Epic Technique

MARTIN T. DINTER

Anatomizing *Civil War*

Anatomizing *Civil War*

Studies in Lucan's Epic Technique

MARTIN T. DINTER

The University of Michigan Press
Ann Arbor

Copyright © Martin T. Dinter 2012
All rights reserved

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publisher.

Published in the United States of America by
The University of Michigan Press
Manufactured in the United States of America
♾ Printed on acid-free paper

2015 2014 2013 2012 4 3 2 1

A CIP catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dinter, Martin T.
Anatomizing Civil War : studies in Lucan's epic technique / Martin Dinter.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-472-11850-2 (hardback) — ISBN 978-0-472-02871-9 (e-book)
1. Lucan, 39–65. Pharsalia. 2. Lucan, 39–65—Technique. 3. Epic poetry, Latin—History and criticism. 4. Rome—History—Civil War, 49–45 B.C.—Literature and the war. I. Title.

PA6480.D56 2012
873'.01—dc23

2012042614

parentibus optimis

Acknowledgments

With great pleasure I thank the following institutions for their kind and generous support in the course of my research: DAAD, Cusanuswerk—bischöfliche Studienförderung e.V., University of Heidelberg-Cambridge Programme, AHRC, St. John's College Benefactor Scholarships, The Cambridge European Trust, The Jebb Fund, The Kurt Hahn Trust, The Fondation Hardt.

The support of the Cambridge Classics Faculty allowed me to attend many a conference. I have presented parts of my Lucan project at research seminars and conferences at the universities of Basel, Bordeaux, Cambridge, Liverpool, Oxford, Rostock, Virginia, Warwick, and Würzburg and have at these occasions greatly benefited from the comments made by Matthew Leigh, Chris Kraus, Shadi Bartsch, Sylvie Franchet d'Esperéy, Christine Walde, Bruce Gibson, Tony Woodman, and Thomas Baier. I also wish to thank Glenn W. Most and Christiane Reitz for their inspirational teaching at Heidelberg, as well as Philip Hardie and John Henderson at Cambridge. The latter has directed my PhD thesis, from which this book stems, toward its completion during three years with much patience, diligence, and encouragement and has been the ideal *Doktorvater.* My thanks to him. I also extend my thanks to Emily Gowers and Stephen Harrison, who have acted as my PhD examiners.

Elaine Fantham has given me access to forthcoming material and kindly read my entire manuscript, and her wise comments have often spurred more than she could ever have imagined, while Michael Reeve's and the late John A. Crook's astute criticism has saved me from many an error. John A. Crook has also kindly provided translations of the *Epitaphium Lucani* and the *Argumenta Lucani*. Philip Hardie has offered generous comments and has made available

excerpts from his forthcoming book on *Fama*,[1] and Susanna Morton Braund has ever so kindly given me permission to use her translation of Lucan—it has stood as model throughout. De Gruyter has kindly given me permission to reuse material from my chapters "Lucan's Epic Body," in *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*, edited by Ch. Walde (Munich: K. G. Saur, 2005), 295–312, and " . . . und es bewegt sich doch—der Automatismus des abgehackten Gliedes in Lukan" in *Lucan between Epic Tradition and Aesthetic Innovation*, edited by Ch. Reitz and N. Hömke (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 175–190. I am also grateful to the Musée Fabre de Montpellier, for granting me the right to reproduce Gericault's painting on the jacket of this book. Particular thanks go to Charles Guerin for his patient and repeated help and cultural diplomacy in this matter.

I am most indebted to the librarians at the Cambridge Classical Library, Stephen Howe and Lyn Bailey, for their splendid cooperation and support. In addition I have received further bibliographical help with hunting down rare continental items from Andreas Bartholomä, Antonia Ruppel, and especially Cornelia Vetter. Inge and Abed Sai have been the most generous of all hosts during my time in Britain, and so has Jesus Agustin Badillo-Corona in Mexico. My parents, who have continually offered their love and support, end this list. I dedicate this work to my mother and the memory of my father, who left us when I had only just finished this project.

Martin T. Dinter

1. Cf. Hardie 2012. Asso 2011 appeared after the manuscript had been completed.

Contents

Introduction 1

Aide-Mémoire: The Plot of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* 5

1. Lucan's Epic Body: Anatomizing *Civil War* 9

2. Embodiments: Lucan and *Fama* 50

3. Autarchic Limbs: *Sententiae* in Lucan 89

4. The Anatomy of Repetition 119

Bibliography 155

Index Locorum 173

General Index 185

Introduction

Let us mop up the blood and appreciate Lucan's epic as a work of art, in the guise of the painting that serves as frontispiece. What would art critics have to say about this picture? Would they judge in the same way as the catalog of a recent London exhibition in which Théodore Géricault's *Study of Truncated Limbs* (c. 1818–19)[1] was displayed, remarking that it "transcends mere horror to achieve an aesthetic, sensuous quality that belies the macabre subject"?[2] Would they join in with Delacroix's 1857 response that it constitutes "the best argument in favour of Beauty as it was intended"?[3]

Today a study of Lucan no longer needs apology, for what was once considered to be not much more than a pile of truncated textual limbs in an unfinished and therefore unpolished epic corpus has been rehabilitated. Morford, Ahl, Johnson, Henderson, Masters, Leigh, and Bartsch have all fought the good fight.[4] Accordingly, from my privileged position I am looking back to a wealth of scholarship that has changed our outlook on Lucan.

Much of the research on Lucan's epic account of the civil war between Julius Caesar and Pompey has focused on politics and ideology. In addition often it has exclusively addressed the question of Lucan's relationship to his presumed sources, not least the prose history of Livy and the account of Caesar himself, or has concerned itself with the influence contemporary rhetorical education and practice has had on Lucan.

1. Oil on canvas 52 × 64 (20.5 × 25.25), Musée Fabre, Montpellier.

2. Noon 2003, 81.

3. Noon 2003, 81.

4. Morford 1967, Ahl 1976, Johnson 1987, Henderson 1987, Masters 1992, Bartsch 1997, Leigh 1997.

My study, however, aims to take Lucan more on his own terms as a poet by examining a number of related techniques that combine to create a unique poetic form and vision. I argue for the importance of a unifying imagery based on the body, whether of the state, of the army, or of the poem itself, for a unifying literary purpose, in which traditional epic and heroic glory is replaced by a different conception of fame, particularly the fame of the poet, and for the unifying, pervasive, and positive contribution of two widely used poetic and rhetorical devices, epigrammatic *sententiae* and abundant repetition of both narrative moves and lexical items. By treating Lucan as a poet we will see how Lucan's epic technique shapes his literary *corpus.*

My first chapter, on Lucan's use of body imagery, explores the use of body vocabulary in Lucan's epic. We find it employed in at least five different connections:

the cosmic body
the Roman state body
the military corps
the human body
the textual body

By examining Lucan's treatment of individual bodies and social groupings I map out the parameters of Lucan's anatomical conceptualization of Rome, the Roman state, and the world as a whole. These parameters are then exemplified by a reading of *BC* 7 and a case study of the epic motif of the automated severed limb.

For the cosmic body Lucan uses gigantomachic imagery and personification to invest earth and heaven, most prominently the sun, with bodily presences, which enable them to take an active part in crafting his world of civil war. Second, the Roman state body is drawn into Lucan's project: throughout, *Roma* carries virtual bodily presence, and extensive play on the many meanings of *caput* positions strife for the *caput mundi* at the very heart of the epic. Third, in the military corps the bodies of the military leaders and that of the armies seem to merge, each representing the other. What is more, overlap of military and body vocabulary makes us read each soldier as epitomizing a larger body. Additionally, human bodies frequently stand in for soulless objects; they pile up and turn into defensive structures—guarding rather than being guarded. Lucan's poetics of namelessness relies heavily on substituting body parts such as *manus* for named characters when denoting those committing *nefas.* Finally Lucan frequently links his fate and fame with that of his textual body and thus designs these *funera mundi* as his own requiem. In sum, Lucan's interlocking

of different levels of often disturbing body imagery creates an epic body that is not whole and closed but unnervingly unfinished and open. By presenting his epic not as a classical whole but as an open body, a vivisection of the Roman Republic, Lucan once more calls the authority of epic into question and exposes the cracks and fissures in a genre that seeks to pass itself off as a seamless whole. Nevertheless, paradoxically Lucan writes himself and his desire for lasting fame into his epic corpus, as my case study of automated severed limbs demonstrates.

Chapters 2 and 3 of my study will further exploit the dichotomy between Lucan's open textual body and the desire for lasting fame that is written into it, while the fourth chapter looks at how the structural device of internal repetition that Lucan employs and the epic's focus on fame are reconciled.

The second chapter focuses on Lucan's care for himself in line with the ancient concern for lasting glory. Lucan works hard to become part of *Fama* so as to cement his lasting glory, and so do the protagonists of his epic. The *Bellum Civile* thus comes to embody Lucan's fame and stands in for the author once his body has perished. This is, however, merely one side of the multifaceted *Fama,* whose name in modern English does not only translate as fame, glory, and renown but also as rumor, report, tradition, and narration. Lucan also employs *Fama*'s other side by introducing narratives with the formula *(ut) fama est* "as the traditional story has it" or *fama ferebat* "it is rumored." In this way she plays an important part in Lucan's epic technique and even becomes a directing force in his epic, spinning a net that motivates much of the action in the plot. After outlining Lucan's relations with *Fama* and the ways he employs her in his epic I argue that despite the absence of any traditional personifications of the kind of Ovid's Hunger, Envy, Sleep, and *Fama* in the *Bellum Civile,* Lucan has created a figure in the witch Erictho that draws many of her characteristics from the Ovidian and Virgilian personification of *Fama.* Erictho, both embodiment of *Fama* and poet figure, is at the same time the most powerful persona in the epic, a fact that reinforces the preeminence of poet and *Fama* in the *Bellum Civile.* In an epic about fame, not fate, Lucan lends a voice to *Fama,* Erictho a body.

Two sections at the end of this chapter then exemplify the workings of *Fama* in Lucan's epic in more detail through a reading of the many voices in *BC* 1 and an analysis of the many *epiphonemata* Lucan offers on one of his poem's *personae,* in which he weighs up a life in just a handful of verses. *Fama* is thus not only desired outcome but integral part that holds together Lucan's literary *corpus.*

Having bolstered in the previous chapters the epic's focus on fame, I examine in my third chapter a feature Lucan was famous for already in antiquity: his *sententiae* (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90). Lucan strives on the syntactic level to

create unique and memorable phrases (*sententiae*), which secure the *Nachleben* of his epic body through excerptability. My reading of Lucan as a mine for one-liners is no modern imposition, but instead confirms that this style of reading brings out the strength of the poem's energetic formulation of its key themes: *sententiae* lay down the epic's laws and simultaneously create a discourse on epic values that spans the entire epic. In addition, to write subversive epic, Lucan sets himself to deconstruct the gnomic code, and creates antiproverbs for the purpose. Renaissance "proverb" collections derived from Lucan's work then stand witness for the *Nachleben* of his autarchic textual limbs. In particular, in 1695 Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff published a collection of 300 proverbs and epigrams extracted from Lucan's *Bellum Civile.*

The fourth chapter looks at the anatomy of repetition in Lucan's *Bellum Civile.* I focus both on verbal repetition and on the repetition of events and pattern, which are often explicitly signposted as reiterations by Lucan. In a reading of selected passages from books 1 and 2, I point out that Lucan shows awareness of the fact that he is to tell an already well-known story, that of the Roman civil war. The epic's first simile in book 1 links the ever-rotating movements of the heavenly bodies to the ever-repeating fratricide of Roman history starting from Romulus and Remus. An old man's lengthy retrospective on the first Roman civil war in book 2 repeats the same story on a grander scale and provides a multitude of images of the slaughter of brothers by brothers. By singling out the so-called "raft of Vulteius" episode from *BC* 4, I demonstrate how this passage can be seen as a *mise en abyme,* a micro-image or miniaturization of the greater literary work it is part of. I conclude the chapter defining Lucan's poetics of repetition and considering how the principles of repetition and fame that permeate the epic can be reconciled. Employing medieval and Renaissance readings and continuations of Lucan, I then discuss the question how Lucan's poetic technique of repetition alters or influences the reader's expectations of how the epic will end.

Aide-Mémoire

The Plot of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*

To ease the reader into Lucan's epic and offer orientation in the *Bellum Civile* I provide a brief summary of the epic's plot.

BOOK 1

Proem (1–7). Rome could have conquered the rest of the world rather than lead civil war (8–32), but this war was worth all its toil as it leads to Nero's reign (33–66). Lucan explains the causes of the civil war, both historical and metaphysical (67–182), and introduces the two main protagonists, Pompey the Great ("Magnus") and (Julius) Caesar (158–82).

Caesar crosses the Rubicon and occupies Ariminum (183–261). Curio and the tribunes of the people join Caesar's troops (261–95). Caesar addresses his armies: they will march on Rome (296–465). Panic breaks out in Rome on hearing rumors of Caesar's advance: the consuls and most senators join Pompey and his troops on their flight from Rome (466–522). A series of bad omens and prodigies unfolds (522–83). The reader of sacrificial entrails Arruns (584–638), the astrologer Nigidius Figulus (639–72), and a raving matron (673–95) predict civil war.

BOOK 2

Lament. The older generation reminisce on the terror of the wars under Marius and Sulla and regret that they will have to live through a further war (1–223). Brutus and Cato are introduced as stout supporters of the Roman Republic.

Marcia, Cato's former wife, remarries him (234–391). Pompey moves with his army toward Brundisium via Capua. Many cities open their gates to Caesar without fight. Domitius Ahenobarbus, a paternal ancestor of Nero, intends to defend Corfinium from Caesar but has to capitulate (392–525). Pompey encourages his troops by reminding them of his former glory. He reaches Brundisium (526–627). While his son and the consuls are sent to the East to recruit more troops, Pompey and his men barely escape Caesar, who occupies the city and blockades its port (628–736).

BOOK 3

On his way to Epirus the ghost of Pompey's deceased wife Julia appears to him in a dream (1–45). Caesar secures grain provision for his army and arrives in Rome. He calls a senate meeting and despite the protests of the tribune Metellus takes over the public monies (46–168). Meanwhile Pompey reaches Dyrrhachium and gathers troops in Greece (169–297). Caesar organizes the siege of Massilia, a city that prefers to remain neutral. He also has a sacred grove in the vicinity cut down (298–452). While Caesar moves on to Spain his admiral Brutus gains victory in a sea battle against the Massilians (453–762).

BOOK 4

In Spain Caesar's troops suffer setbacks through flooding and hunger, but in the end the Pompeians under their generals Petreius and Afranius have to capitulate for lack of water (1–401). On the island Curicta the troops of the Caesarian legate Antonius are blockaded by Pompeians. They attempt to escape on rafts. One of these loaded with men from Opitergium is caught. After putting on a brave fight their commander Vulteius leads them to communal suicide (402–581). In Africa Curio leads Caesar's troops against Varus and King Juba. A native tells him the story of Hercules' fight against the giant Antaeus (581–660). After initial success Curio's troops get caught in a trap set by Juba and are eliminated. Curio kills himself and is commemorated by Lucan with an obituary (661–824).

BOOK 5

The senate comes together in Epirus and appoints Pompey as commander in chief (1–64). The Pompeian Appius questions the Delphic oracle (64–236). Caesar's troops stage a mutiny but he manages to suppress it (237–373). He crosses from Brundisium to Epirus with part of his troops; his commander Antonius

hesitates to ship over the remaining troops from Italy in the teeth of wintry weather. When attempting to return to Italy to fetch his troops Caesar has to brave an immense storm and must turn back (374–702). Finally his troops arrive (703–21). Pompeius moves his wife Cornelia to safety in Lesbos and then leaves for Dyrrhachium (722–815).

BOOK 6

The armies face each other at Dyrrhachium: Pompey's troops suffer plague, Caesar's hunger. Caesar surrounds Pompey's camp with a rampart, which Scaeva defends heroically against large numbers of Pompeian troops (1–262). Thanks to informers Pompey manages to break out of Caesar's siege and weakens the enemy (263–313). But instead of returning to Italy to declare victory Pompey pursues Caesar's army to Thessaly (314–32). After a geographical excursus on Thessaly (333–412) Lucan describes how Sextus Pompeius seeks out the advice of the Thessalian witch Erictho, who performs a necromancy (413–830).

BOOK 7

The night before the battle of Pharsalus Pompey dreams of his former greatness (1–44). His soldiers want to fight but Pompey hesitates, for the omens are bad (45–213). The troops take their positions (214–34). Both Caesar and Pompey address their troops (235–336; 337–84). Lucan bewails the effects this battle will have on Rome's future (385–459). The battle begins and the fighting is ferocious. Pompey's cavalry fails; Domitius Ahenobarbus is the one fallen soldier Lucan names; Caesar's victory is clear (460–646). Pompey flees to Larissa (647–727). Caesar storms the Pompeian camp, where he spends the night plagued by nightmares. The next day he gazes at the dead on the battlefield while holding a banquet. He forbids their burial (728–864).

BOOK 8

Pompey flees over the sea to his wife Cornelia at Lesbos. The citizen of Mytilene offer him asylum but he declines (1–158). Pompey departs and after a council meeting Deiotarus is sent out on a special mission (159–255). In a senate meeting in Cilicia Pompey ponders where to go to raise new troops. After Parthia is rejected (256–441) Pompey decides to go to Egypt, whose young king Ptolemy, at war with his older sister Cleopatra, owes him gratitude (442–471). Ptolemy's advisers sway the boy against Pompey (472–560). On arrival in Egypt Pompey is met by two former Roman soldiers in a small boat. Fallen into the trap, he

is killed and decapitated. Pompey's seal and embalmed head are brought to Ptolemy (560–711); his headless trunk floats along the coast and is granted a makeshift funeral by a follower (712–872).

BOOK 9

Pompey's ascension (1–18). Cato takes over Pompey's cause. In the presence of Cornelia and Pompey's sons a ceremony is held to honor Pompey and those fallen at Pharsalus (19–217). After some discussion the troops and allies swear allegiance to Cato. Because of a storm at sea they march through the Libyan desert via Tripolis to Leptis Magna (218–949). En route they pass the oracle of Ammon, which Cato decides not to consult (511–86), and are attacked by a multitude of snakes. Lucan's Medusa excursus (619–700) provides an explanation for the snakes' existence. The exhausted troops arrive at Leptis Magna (938–49). Caesar meanwhile travels to Egypt—with a stopover and guided tour at the ruins of Troy (950–99). On arrival the Egyptians hand over Pompey's head and seal, which Caesar greets with crocodile tears (1000–1108).

BOOK 10

Caesar visits the tomb of Alexander the Great (1–52). King Ptolemy attempts to stir up trouble. Cleopatra seduces Caesar and he sides with her cause (53–106). Lucan describes a famously luxurious feast (107–331), as part of which Caesar consults the priest Acoreus about the sources of the Nile (172–331). Ptolemy's advisers, however, fearing Caesar's revenge, kindle war in an attempt to eliminate Caesar. Cleopatra's sister Arsinoe joins the rebel army. A final scene depicts Caesar's life in great danger when he sees Scaeva nearby (332–546). The epic ends more or less where Caesar's own account in his *commentarii de bello civili* ends.

CHAPTER 1

Lucan's Epic Body

Anatomizing *Civil War*

Lucan's epic of civil war has been accused of headlessness and interpreted as a truncated torso—a disorganized epic that mirrors the chaos of war on all imaginable levels. With the leitmotif "*plus quam*" (more than *BC* 1.1) announced in its very first line this epic strives to be "more than," and as such aims to exceed many of the expectations traditionally aroused by the epic genre and its narrative economy. Unlike Virgil's *Aeneid*, the matrix Lucan constantly aims to supersede, the plot of the *Bellum Civile*—which incorporates nearly all the known world from Libyan deserts to the famously unlocatable sources of the Nile—never forms an integrated unit and fails to create a unity of cosmos and imperium.[1] Instead Lucan forms an epic body with disturbingly many parts that from the moment of its birth confronts the reader with its (self)destruction.[2] To be sure, a veritable deluge of horrid gore and bloodshed stains Lucan's epic; but I shall highlight the significance of depicting mutilation and the body. My principal aim in this chapter is to show how Lucan binds together his epic corpus by putting emphasis on the concept of the body, and then to show in subsequent chapters how Lucan's epic exploits this conceptualization and binds Lucan's epic body together through the use of *Fama*, *sententiae*, and internal repetition. In this first chapter it will become clear that the *Bellum Civile* is

1. Narducci 1985 and Albrecht 1999, 227–50.

2. Cf. [. . .] *canimus populumque potentem / in sua victrici conversum viscera dextra* (and we sing of a mighty people attacking its own guts with victorious sword-hand, *BC* 1.2–3). This image is an actualization of the Latin expression *bellum intestinum* (internal war; cf. *Liv*. 4.43.10, 42.13.7, and 42.40.7; Sall. *Cat.* 5.2 and Cic. *Cat.* 2.28).

organized not by standard structural features such as linearity, teleology, or causality, but through imagery, in this case representations of the body, which unifies the work even as it mirrors and enacts fragmentation.[3]

Lucan employs the word *corpus* (body) 64 times in all in his extant text.[4] Moreover, body vocabulary is of high frequency throughout, as he uses a multitude of body imagery.[5] So far scholarly discussions have exhausted themselves in focusing on a few prominent passages, while wider systematization of Lucan's concept of the body has not been attempted. For this reason, in the first instance categorization is required, but as will become apparent, it is precisely in those cases where boundaries are crossed and categories overlap, that we gain insights into the poetics of Lucan's body imagery.

In general Lucan uses body vocabulary in at least five different connections:

1. the cosmic body
2. the Roman state body
3. the military corps
4. the human body
5. the textual body

In what follows I will outline these categories and examine the role they play in Lucan's strategy of body imagery. In the first part of this chapter we will see how body imagery permeates Lucan's epic. Through its versatility it serves as narrative glue that connects the many different and episodic limbs of the epic body. Second, I shall provide a reading of *Bellum Civile* 7 with focus on corporeality and also examine one particular motif out of the wealth of body imagery on offer in the *Bellum Civile,* that of the automatism of the severed limb. Here we will be able to observe how Lucan makes use of body imagery to showcase his poetics.

---

3. Rimell 2002, 9–16 points out the all-pervasiveness of the leitmotif of body imagery in another Neronian text, Petronius's *Satyricon.* She finds that the surviving fragments are connected by an imagery of disintegration, expressed through the pervasive metaphor of the literary text as a human or animal body.

4. The details: bk. 1: 1; bk. 2: 5; bk. 3: 8; bk. 4: 8; bk. 5: 2; bk. 6: 13; bk. 7: 8; bk. 8: 6; bk. 9: 12; bk. 10:1. In comparison Virgil uses corpus 52 times in the 12 books of the *Aeneid* and Ovid who tells of bodies changed into new forms uses it 261 times in the 15 books of the *Metamorphoses.*

5. *Manus* (hand) 137 times, *pectus* (chest) 107, *caput* (head) 84, *membrum* (limb) 70, *tergum* (back) 35, *artus* (limb) 32, *iugulum* (throat) 29, *oculus* (eye) 29, *lumen* (eye) 28, *collum* (neck) 27, *viscus* (usually pl. internal organs) 24, *latus* (side) 22, *pes* (foot) 12, *auris* (ear) 9, *ala* (upper arm) 4, *naris* (nose) 3, statistics that demonstrate the omnipresence of corporeality in the *Bellum Civile.*

The Cosmic Body

This section will look at two phenomena: one is that in the Latin language (as in many) the lexicographic meaning of body vocabulary often allows it to be applied to geography and cosmology. Just as English uses expressions such as "on the face of the earth" or "from the mouth of a river" and "under the eyes of the sun," Latin employs body language in a similar way—at times even exceeding the possibilities offered by English.[6] I shall exemplify this with a detailed examination of the semantics of the word *caput.* First, however, I shall discuss how ancient geography frequently conveys a sense of corporeality in that it is imbued with landmarks that are the physical remains of Greek and Roman mythology. In what follows I shall showcase some examples to illustrate Lucan's geographics of corporeality.

The importance of images taken from cosmological mythology, most prominently the gigantomachy, for shaping an epic's message has been well established.[7] In the *Aeneid* the replay of the conflict between gods and giants in the Hercules and Cacus episode affirms the reader's premonition of witnessing the establishment of a new world order; Virgil's epic successors frequently exploit this imagery, often prompted by the alleged physical remains of this mythic battle, the mountains of Phlegra, Mt. Aetna and Mt. Atlas.[8] Indeed, Lucan's epic relates how the gaze of the Gorgon petrifies Atlas and turns the other giants into mountains and thereby decides the gigantomachy in favor of the gods (*BC* 9.654–58).[9] Furthermore Lucan invests his Thessaly excursus with a geography of tendentiously displaced mountains, as if to remind the reader that these once had been piled up by giants in an attempt to storm heaven. Together with constant echoes of giantomachy throughout the poem this serves to keep the reader aware of the inventory of this very myth.[10] As a result, Earth herself is

6. If this is the case I shall point in brackets to Latin body vocabulary in the English translation. The translations provided are based upon those of Susanna Braund, who has kindly given me permission to use them.

7. Hardie 1986, 85–156 and Hardie 1993, index s.v. "gigantomachy."

8. Hardie 1993, 83–84.

9. Mt. Atlas can serve as a showcase for Virgil's tame but persistent corporeal geography. Throughout the *Aeneid* Virgil refers to Atlas as both a mountain and a person. Cf. Hardie 1986, 264. Accordingly, the way Mercury sees him in passing on his way to Carthage wavers between describing man and mountain (*Aen.* 4.246–51). It thus makes us aware how much of Latin body vocabulary can be applied to both humans and landscape. For the near endless possibilities of the metaphorical use of Latin body vocabulary and its versatility cf. André 1992, 249–59.

10. Cf. Masters 1992, 39–40 and 154–55 on Lucan's deliberately incorrect positioning of Mt. Ossa and Mt. Pelion in his Thessalian excursus, *BC* 6.333–36, which plays upon the displacement of these mountains during the gigantomachy to build a bridge to heaven; Mayer 1981 *ad* 8.551 lists most instances of gigantomachic imagery.

endowed with a sense of corporeality: she initially gave birth to the giants and now bears their dead bodies as mountains. This notion of a geography full of bodily presences is enhanced in the Hercules and Antaeus episode in *BC* 4, where Lucan spells out his own version of the gigantomachy. Here *Tellus*/*Terra* (Earth) is introduced as a childbearing mother and turns into one of the epic's protagonists: *nondum post genitos* ***Tellus*** *effeta gigantes / terribilem Libycis partum concepit in antris* (After the Giants' birth, Earth not yet exhausted mothered a dreadful offspring in Libyan caves, *BC* 4.593–94).[11] Through the body of her son Antaeus, whose energy recharges as soon as he touches the ground and who incorporates her chthonic powers, Earth is allowed to take part in the fight (*BC* 4.636–37, 4.598–99, and 4.608). Accordingly she is depicted as a "split divinity" when Lucan employs both *terra* and *tellus* in the same sentence as if they were separate items: *quisquis inest* ***terris,*** *in fessos spiritus artus / egeritur* ***Tellus****que viro luctante laborat* (All the power of the **land** pours into his [Antaeus's] tired frame and **Earth** labors as her warrior wrestles, *BC* 4.643–44).[12] As a result Lucan can show how Mother *Tellus* struggles when Antaeus falls back heavily onto the resources of the earth. Finally the separation of mother and son into single units, their losing touch, decides the fight in favor of Hercules (*BC* 4.645–51). However, thanks to her twofold nature Antaeus's mother *Tellus* is at least able to preserve her son's name in geographical terms: Antaeus gives his name to a kingdom. Accordingly Antaeus's name provides a frame for the entire passage (*BC* 4.589–90 and 4.654–55). For on the surface the Antaeus episode ostensibly serves to explain the nomenclature of the area Scipio finds himself in.

Furthermore Lucan marks out the importance of gigantomachic imagery by comparing civil war to gigantomachy (*BC* 1.33–37). The latter was a precondition for Jupiter's reign, while civil war smoothes the way for Nero. Lucan's commemoration of inter-Roman disasters in the verses that follow ends with the slave wars at the foot of Mt. Aetna, pointing to yet another monument to gigantomachy on the surface of the earth (*BC* 1.43). He thus effectively links together places of memory—or scars if translated into body language—on both the cosmic and the Roman state body.[13] Subsequently Lucan introduces a human body—the emperor Nero's—exerting cosmic power and emphatically controlling the world: Nero's godly weight alone will crush the cosmos should

11. Cf. also Ov. *Met.* 1.156–60.

12. Solodow 1988, 94–96 introduces the term "split divinity" to describe Ovid's depictions of Hunger and Envy.

13. For the role scars play as memory of the body cf. Baroin 2002. For an overview of approaches to "body and memory" cf. Öhlschläger and Wiens 1997, 9–17 and Assmann 1999, 298–337 on places of memory.

he lose his poise: *aetheris immensi partem si presseris unam / sentiet axis onus* (If you press on either side of the boundless ether, the sky will feel the weight, *BC* 1.56–57).[14] Despite echoing with reminiscences of Phaethon, Nero's body is nevertheless construed as the center of the universe. The emperor turns into a towering giant of cosmic dimensions victorious in gigantomachy and civil war.[15]

Additionally, Lucan's poetic technique of depicting stars and heavenly bodies as *personae* rather than extraterrestrial objects populates his poem with further protagonists. We find Lucan's world cluttered with personifications of cosmic bodies, which fill his world with a sense of corporeality: Phoebus/Titan represent the sun, Phoebe/Cynthia the moon, Mulciber/Vulcan stand for fire and Tethys for the ocean. In connection with geographical terms Latin geography in general and Lucan's geography in particular exhibits body imagery: *percussit* ***Latiare caput*** ([a thunderbolt] struck the **head** of Latium [= a landmark], *BC* 1.535); ***caput*** . . . *Titan cum ferret* (while Titan ([= the Sun] is lifting up his **head**, 1.540); ***ora*** . . . *Aetna* (Etna's **mouth**, 1.545); *ignis in Hesperium cecidit* ***latus*** (fire's flames fell on to Hesperia's ***flank***, 1.547); ***sanguineum*** . . . *mare* (a **blood**-red sea, 1.548). This allows the poet to interlink the fate of the cosmic body with that of the other bodies in his epic by exploiting the multiple layers of meaning of Latin body vocabulary.[16]

Furthermore, throughout *BC* 1 Lucan keeps the analogy between the Roman body and the cosmic body present through similes: the shout of the Caesarian troops sounds like the north wind in a Thracian forest (1.89–91);[17] the panic of the inhabitants of Rome is reminiscent of fire and earthquake (1.493–95), and Rome is depicted as ship of state, abandoned when threatened by the elements (1.498–503). Undeniably Lucan means to link the fate of the cosmos with that of Rome. He fastidiously prepares his *funera mundi* (apocalypse) with a wealth of body imagery, which serves as textual glue for the fraying world of Lucan's epic.

The actions of these personified cosmic bodies frequently translate the notion of civil strife onto a higher, cosmic level. The morning star thus displays the

---

14. The same idea is used in connection with a real cosmic unit, Libya, whose storms if opposed by more than just sand would have the power to turn the world upside down (*BC* 9.466–68).

15. Nero's cosmic presence seems like a precedent for the medieval doctrine of the king's two bodies. One human and mortal; the other immortal and bound to the king's office fashioned to guarantee continuity of the world's order once the king dies. Kantorowicz 1957, 500–501 discusses the *Lives* of the Roman emperors under this aspect. Cf. Bredekamp 1998 and Faber 1998 for the reception of this medieval doctrine.

16. On the rise and origin of the corporeal image of the cosmos cf. Barkan 1975, 8–27. Moreover cf. Ricoux 2002 on melothesia, the idea that the planets and the signs of the zodiac each rule over specific parts of the body.

17. The geographical details of this simile point to the "Emathian" stage at Pharsalus; cf. Miura 1983, 222.

behavior of a military leader: *Lucifer a Casia prospexit rupe diemque / misit in Aegypton* (Lucifer looked down from the Casian rock and sent the daylight into Egypt, *BC* 10.434–35). Brotherly strife, the conflict between siblings, is first introduced and exemplified by sun and moon (*fratri contraria Phoebe / ibit* "Phoebe (moon) will confront her brother," *BC* 1.77–78]).[18] Later Phoebe, the moon, will respond to Pompey's death by dimming her light. The most developed cosmic "character" in the *Bellum Civile*, however, is the sun. More frequently than using the word *sol* (39 times) Lucan dubs the sun *Phoebus* (33 times) and *Titan* (15 times).[19] Sometimes *Phoebus* also denotes Apollo. The reader is thus switching between person and personification. In this way Lucan endows this heavenly body with the opportunity of acting and interacting like a person.

With the inclusion of cosmic bodies in his world of civil war Lucan clearly surpasses any of his epic predecessors.[20] Virgil's sun habitually displays a peaceful and inconspicuous elegance in signifying the passing of time.[21] Only in isolated cases such as prayers and declarations is *Sol* evoked as personified god (*Aen.* 4.607, 1.568, 12.176). Moreover, of the 36 times Virgil uses *Phoebus* in the *Aeneid* only four denote the sun (*Aen.* 3.637, 4.6, 10.216, 11.913).This result is not surprising for an epic in which the hero's quest is guided by gods and destined by fate.

In addition Lucan uses the term *Phoebus* ten times to denote the god of prophecy (and poetry), Phoebus Apollo. From his violent entry when stirring the *matrona furens* in *BC* 1 onward, the god's aggressive appearance throughout the epic seems noteworthy (*urgentem pectora Phoebum* "[revealing that] Phoebus is harrying her breast," *BC* 1.677).[22] Not unlike the sun—his *alter ego*—Apollo, too, is adapted to suit the subject of the poem he features in. Usually presiding over the production of poetry as Apollo Musagetes, the leader of the Muses, the god is here subordinated to poetry. He thus resumes his Iliadic role as an angry god, starring as an angry voice in a new epic of anger. The subordinate role Apollo plays in this epic finds expression in his confinement to two short passages in *BC* 1 and *BC* 5. The *Bellum Civile* is not an epic in which the gods have much say.

By contrast, in Lucan's *Bellum Civile* the Sun is frequently employed—not unlike Earth in the Hercules and Antaeus episode—as a split divinity who reads

---

18. On brothers in civil war cf. Bannon 1997, 112–16 and 137–58. Cf. Fantham 2010 on Lucan's civil war imagery. For comparative material from Greek sources cf. Wolpert 2002 and Price 2001.

19. On the various terms denoting the sun in Lucan (including statistics) cf. Tucker 1983.

20. Catrein 2003, 43–73 examines the visual metaphors of the Augustan poets.

21. Cf. *interea magnum sol circumvolvitur annum* (meanwhile the sun wheels round the mighty circuit of the year, *Aen.* 3.284) and also *Aen.* 3.508.

22. Cf. also *BC* 1.681 and 1.694. In *BC* 5 we even witness instances of Phoebus standing for both the Delphic oracle and the sun. Oracle: *BC* 5.70, 73, 136, 152, 156, 174, 187, 223; Sun: 5.424, 542. Neither in *BC* 1 nor *BC* 5 is the god ever at peace (*BC* 5.174, 5.186–87).

both as *persona* and as violent cosmic force. On occasion the Sun raises his head or "travels" its course (*BC* 1.540; *BC* 3.40–41). More frequently, however, he is found engaged in aggressive activities. Thus, the Sun with his rays presses hard on the constellation of the Nemean Lion (*BC* 1.655–56), "banishes chilly darkness" (*BC* 2.326) and turns the Syrtes into a battlefield between ocean and sunlight (*BC* 9.315). Similar instances of the Sun's militant behavior abound, whether he seizes the equatorial zone or stages a conflict with Mt. Pelion's shadow (*BC* 10.251, 6.335–36).[23] In Lucan's cosmos the elements are constantly in a state of competition with each other and seem to conduct their own war. Sometimes Earth gives in entirely to the Sun's burning forces (*nil* ***obstat*** *Phoebo* "there is no obstacle to Phoebus," *BC* 9.528). Frequently we also find water in the form of oceans and rivers as the Sun's opponent. As water can break the Sun's rays, the reader witnesses a constant struggle for the upper hand between these two elements (*BC* 3.521–22). Usually the Sun dominates, but sometimes water and Sun are evenly matched, and in exceptional cases the Sun is successfully opposed (*et* ***par*** *Phoebus aquis* "Phoebus, a match for the waters," *BC* 4.124; cf. the Ganges, *BC* 3.230–32). Furthermore, before the sea storm in *BC* 5 Sun turns into an image of civil war: he divides his rays and summons up opposing winds for a war of the elements.[24] His corporeality allows the sun to play an active part in Lucan's world at war. As we shall see, this body imagery interlinks the cosmic body with other instances of body imagery that in turn weave a net that holds the many parts of Lucan's epic.

What is more, the twofold eclipse of the sun (*BC* 1.540–54, 7.199–200) constitutes the ultimate sign of apocalyptic cosmic disorder, in which the cosmic body mirrors the cataclysmic Roman state body. The eclipse also serves as a point of reference to another textual body, Thyestes' infamous meal.[25] Lucan indicates here his awareness that he rewrites and simultaneously supersedes the scale of previous strife between brothers.

The sunrise before Caesar's blitz occupation of Ariminum constitutes an instance where the cosmic body seems to anticipate the action of the military corps. All stars but one flee the light of the sun, just as one might have expected the city's inhabitants to flee from Caesar had they not been stunned by fear (*BC* 1.231–32).[26] Moreover, the elements can even take over the war entirely, as the

---

23. Cf. Masters 1992, 150–78 for Lucan's geography of war.

24. Cf. Loupiac 1998, 91–95 and *BC* 5.541–43. Note also that the warlike vocabulary of *Phoebus / **fregit** aquis radios* (Phoebus scattered his rays above the sea, 3.521–22) marks the beginning of the sea battle at Massilia.

25. Cf. *qualem fugiente per ortus / sole Thyesteae noctem duxere Mycenae* (just such night came on at Mycenae of Thyestes when the sun fled eastward, *BC* 1.543–44). On the disappearance of the sun in Seneca's Thyestes cf. Schiesaro 2003, 170–72.

26. Similarly when Pompey's fate hangs in the air in *BC* 8 the appearance of the sun mirrors this transitory state (8.159–61).

flood at Ilerda in *BC* 4 demonstrates: *hactenus armorum discrimina; cetera bello / fata dedit variis incertus motibus aer* (So far only were the tests those of weapons: the rest of the battle's fates came from the air, *BC* 4.48–49). Once more we find a passage studded with the language of war but describing the actions of the cosmic body.[27] In addition Caesar subsequently treats the river Sicoris not unlike a rebellious soldier who can easily be punished (*BC* 4.141–43). The elements, however, do not cease to play their part as war proceeds: in *BC* 5 the winds trap Caesar's fleet on two occasions, provoking Caesar to demonstrate his superiority. First the sea holds his ships back at Brundisium (*BC* 5.407–8 with OLD *claudo* 7 = military, to blockade). Then a calm prevents the ships from crossing the sea (*BC* 5.442–43). All these events, however, are framed by displays of Caesar's authority over the military and the cosmic body—in words and deeds. When addressing his rebellious soldiers, Caesar employs a simile that marks him out as the ocean with his troops as tributary rivers.[28] According to Caesar's vision of the universe, their presence or absence would make no difference to the might of the sea (*veluti, si cuncta minentur / flumina quos miscent pelago subducere fontes, / non magis ablatis umquam descenderit aequor, / quam nunc crescit, aquis* "it is as if all rivers threatened to withdraw the streams they mingle with the sea: with those waters gone, the sea level would fall no more than it now rises," *BC* 5.336–39). Caesar then soon tests his powers on the open sea, taking on the elements with godlike self-confidence in a tiny boat—and escapes unharmed (*BC* 5.499–501). Thus not alone the cosmic body defies human and military bodies successfully. Rather, Lucan's body politics take an unexpected turn when he depicts a human body, that is, Caesar's, contesting the cosmic one successfully.

The Roman State Body

The "analogy . . . between the body's destiny and that of societies and institutions" lets us draw parallels between the integrity of the individual body and the integrity of the "communal body."[29] The image of the city of Rome as a body

27. Cf. ***urebant*** *montana nives* (snow scorched the mountains, 4.52); *Cynthia [. . .] /* ***exclusit*** *borean* (Cynthia [the moon] shut out Boreas [the north wind], 4.60–61); *ille [. . .] nubes [. . .] /* ***torsit*** (he [the east wind] hurled clouds, 4.62–63); *quidquid [. . .]* ***impulerat*** *Corus, quidquid* ***defenderat*** *Indos* (vapors driven by Corus [northwest wind], vapors that had defended the Indians, 4.66–67).

28. On the rhetoric of the entire mutiny passage cf. Fantham 1985.

29. Gilman 1979, 42.

with many a limb has remained a much-employed topos ever since Livy related Menenius Agrippa's fable.[30] Rome's many institutions form all the parts of its body, while its anatomy has been dissected in topographical terms, from the head, the Capitol, via the stomach, the Subura quarter, to the excretory duct, the *cloaca maxima*.[31] This image of the city and state as body exerts influence on the way we describe societies and cities and the language in which we think about them.[32] Toward the end of the *Bellum Civile* the body of Alexander the Great, which lies preserved in Alexandria, is a striking reminder of the correlation between a ruler's body and his empire.[33] Even though Alexander was the ultimate ruler, his empire falls apart at the very moment the ruler's body becomes defunct: *quo totum ceperat orbem / abstulit imperium nulloque herede relicto / totius fati* ***lacerandas*** *praebuit urbes* (He took away with him the power with which he had captured all the world, and, leaving none as heir of his entire fortune, he exposed the cities to be torn apart, *BC* 10.44–45). The use of *lacerare* enhances the image of Alexander's empire as a body (OLD *lacero* 1). Potential correspondences with Caesar's body and the Roman Empire are made painfully obvious.[34]

Throughout the *Bellum Civile*, Rome lends herself to a series of embodiments, from the personification of *Roma* (*BC* 1.186–92) and Arruns's sacrificial victim (1.616–30) to the collapsing body of the *matrona furens* (1.695).[35] Moreover, Rome is most strikingly represented by the bodies of the two competing leaders, Caesar and Pompey. This is exemplified "by the sudden withering of the traditional organs of the state into the one body of Caesar on his entry into Rome" (3.105–9), which culminates in the phrase *omnia Caesar erat* (Caesar was everything, *BC* 3.108).[36] Additionally, Rome is at times granted almost bodily presence through the many apostrophes directed at "her" by the author (19 times, including her very first appearance).[37] What is more, we encounter

30. *Liv.* 2.32.8 ff.

31. Gowers 1995, 26–27.

32. The body as political metaphor has been theorized by Turner 1984 and Shilling 1993. Cf. Sennett 1994 on city bodies. In addition body imagery has also been transposed most powerfully onto Christianity, e.g., 1 Cor. 12–27.

33. Cf. *editus exemplum terras tot posse sub* ***uno*** */ esse* ***viro*** (born as an example that so many lands could be under one man's sway, *BC* 10.27–28).

34. Spencer 2005 suggests seeing Lucan's Troy and Egypt as reconfiguration of Rome and the empire implicated in corruption.

35. Cf. Douglas 1986, 114–15 on living organisms, especially sacrificial victims, representing complex social forms in rituals.

36. Hardie 1993, 8.

37. Rome is addressed in *BC* 1.21, 1.200, 1.519, 1.670, 2.56, 2.301, 3.96, 3.159, 4.692, 6.302, 6.312, 6.326, 7.91, 7.418, 7.439, 7.556, 8.322, 8.836, 9.602.

her frequently as *persona agens.*[38] Indeed the reader gains the impression that the civil war turns into a wooing of Rome by the epic's protagonists, a Rome caught in a deathly love affair (*si tantus amor belli tibi, Roma* "if your love of war is so great, Rome," *BC* 1.21). Caesar pledges himself ever her soldier, a violent actualization of the *militia amoris* of Roman love elegy (*BC* 1.201–2).[39] This trope is enhanced by Caesar in an admiring speech delivered when he is facing Rome again after a long spell of absence on military campaigns abroad (*BC* 3.91–92). Conversely, Cato conjures up the image of Rome as a corpse, which he wishes to embrace one last time. In his opinion we inexorably march toward Rome's funeral: *non ante revellar / exanimem quam te complectar, Roma* (I will not be torn away before embracing your lifeless body, Rome, *BC* 2.301–2). In an act of *devotio* Cato offers to sacrifice his own body in place of Rome's, to substitute his head for hers, so that his blood may be shed instead of Rome's (*BC* 2.304–7 and 2.312–13). The subsequent return of Cato's pious wife Marcia spells out this chaste union between Cato and Rome in human terms.

> MARCIA: *quoque modo natos, hoc est amplexa maritum* (She embraced her husband as she did her sons, *BC* 2.366)
> CATO: *urbi pater est urbique maritus* (For Rome he is father and for Rome he is husband, *BC* 2.388)

Cato is much more *pater patriae* than *amator patriae*, a father figure rather than a lover. Accordingly, he feels for Rome like a parent at his children's funeral (*BC* 2.297–302).

Pompey, for his part, defines a new Rome for himself after the defeat at Pharsalus, when the real Rome has been lost for him. It is the place where his beloved wife Cornelia is situated: *hic mihi Roma fuit* (Here was Rome for me, *BC* 8.133).[40] Finally with the invocation *Roma, fave coeptis* (*BC* 1.200 and repeated in 8.322) both Caesar and Pompey fashion Rome in Ovidian manner as a Muse and elegiac *puella*: she is the driving force and inspiration behind their actions.[41]

---

38. Cf. Rome as *persona agens* in *BC* 1.285 *tibi Roma subegerit orbem* (yours will be the world subdued by Rome), 2.297 *Roma cadat* (that Rome should fall); 2.551–52 *Roma . . . opposuit* (Rome set against); 5.662 *vidit . . . Roma* (Rome has seen); cf. also *BC* 6.320–21, 7.371–73, 7.410, 7.458–59, 7.556, 7.634, 8.238, 8.354, 8.842–43, 8.847, 9.1104.

39. Cf. also Keith 2000, 101–31, esp. 130 on male violence unleashed upon the eroticized female body in Latin epic.

40. For the conflation of Pompey's love for Cornelia and Rome cf. Ahl 1976, 177–83 and 250.

41. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.2–3 and *ars* 1.30. Cf. Bömer 1969–87, *ad Met.* 1.2 *coeptis* for further examples of invocations containing "*coeptis*." For Caesar's refashioning of the republican *Roma* as imperial *Roma* in his prayer at *BC* 1.195–200 cf. Feeney 1991, 292–94.

Caput

Lucan exploits the traditional repertoire of body metaphors from Rome's topography with a recurrent and large-scale double entendre on Rome's role as the *caput rerum* (head of [all] things)—a role initially prophesied by an actual head excavated on the Capitoline hill in Rome's early history (*Liv.* 1.55.5–6). Thanks to its versatility, the word *caput* serves as one of the master tropes in the *Bellum Civile*—employed frequently and on different semantic levels, it serves to connect the many episodes and link the various bodily entities in Lucan's epic.[42]

Already the first instance of the word *caput* signifies the upheaval of the Roman body: as a portent of what is to come, lightning hits the *mons Albanus*, the geographical "**head**" of Latium (*Latiare caput*, *BC* 1.535). Significantly, this is the very place where each spring in an annual rite the consuls celebrated the *feriae Latinae*, the Latin festival, which commemorated and renewed the alliance of the cities of Latium, the unity of Rome. In addition, the *duo capita* (two heads / double lobes) of the bull's liver at Arruns's sacrifice (*BC* 1.627–28) point to the two competing parties of the civil war and their respective leaders. At the same time they embody Roman paranoia that the capital of the world could be transferred elsewhere.[43] As we shall see, play with the many levels on which *caput* can be employed runs through the entire epos.

Rome, the *caput mundi* (head/capital of the world, *BC* 2.136), is easily won by Caesar in the civil war: *sufficerent aliis [. . .] / ipsa, caput mundi,* ***bellorum maxima merces,*** */ Roma capi facilis* (Others might be satisfied with the easy capture of Rome itself, **war's greatest prize**, *BC* 2.653–56). Lucan here varies verse 2.227–88, *exulibus Mariis* ***bellorum maxima merces*** */ Roma recepta fuit* (For the Marian exiles, war's greatest prize was Rome regained), signifying that Caesar is even more ambitious than Marius. The real fight that permeates the epic, however, that between Caesar and Pompey for the position of *caput mundi*, has only just started; Caesar thus remains *in omnia* ***praeceps*** (*BC* 2.656), pressing on headlong, a pun on the etymology of the word *praeceps*.[44] Caesar's hopes before the battle of Pharsalus anticipate that one of the leaders will (in one sense or another) pay for his defeat with his "head" (*placet alea fati / alterutrum mersura* ***caput*** "He chooses the gamble of Fate bound to plunge in ruin one or other head," *BC* 6.8). The integrity of the bodies of the two rivaling leaders thus gains significance—it becomes symptomatic of the success or failure

42. Cf. OLD *caput* for a host of meanings.

43. Cf. Edwards 1996, 19.

44. For the ancient etymology of *praeceps* stemming from *caput* cf. Maltby 1991, 490. The leitmotif *praeceps* runs through the entire epos and culminates in *BC* 7. Cf. Braund 1992, xlvi.

of the fighting parties.[45] Hence both Caesar and Pompey are perceived as *caput orbis* (head of the world) by their followers (Caesar: *BC* 5.686; Pompey: 9.123–24). Thus in a central scene of the *Bellum Civile* the murder and decapitation of Pompey (8.682–83) is equated, as Hardie puts it, "with the loss of Rome itself as 'head of the world' *caput mundi* (9.123–25)."[46]

Furthermore, in conscious opposition to the easily conquered head of Rome, Lucan introduces untamable heads on the level of geography (*indomitum caput Rheni* "Rhine's unconquered head," *BC* 2.52). The image of a head to denote the sources of rivers is of only marginal prominence as long as Pompey's head has not yet been conquered.[47] After Pompey's decapitation, however, when the reader would naturally expect the recurrent play on *caput* to cease, Lucan enhances and reinforces the image of the omnipotent head in his Medusa excursus in *BC* 9, where we encounter in Medusa's *caput* a head that has the power to shape even the cosmic body (*BC* 9.666, 673, 679).[48] Medusa's powerful head perpetuates itself in the Libyan snakes whose heads are their most prominent feature and who throughout the snake catalog repeatedly attack the heads of Cato's soldiers.[49] The double-headed *amphisbaena* (*BC* 9.719) even seems like a micro-image of Rome and its two leaders. *BC* 9 in the end culminates with yet another parallel to Perseus carrying the head of Medusa, the image of Caesar empowered by the possession of Pompey's head.[50]

What is more, head imagery gains vital importance when the head of the river Nile (*ignotumque caput* "[Nile's] unknown source," *BC* 10.191)—unconquered and maybe unconquerable—captures Caesar's attention. For a brief moment this very head is invested with the power to shape the plot: Caesar would happily abandon civil war to explore the source of the Nile: *spes sit mihi certa videndi / Niliacos fontes, bellum civile relinquam* (let me have a hope assured of seeing the springs of Nile, and I will abandon civil war, *BC* 10.191–92). The Nile's *arcanum caput* (hidden source, *BC* 10.295) thus takes over the central role Pompey's head played earlier.

45. Hardie 1993, 8 on the "one for many" principle in relation to the body of Caesar and the organs of state. Hardie also points to Kantorowicz's suggestive epilogue. Cf. Kantorowicz 1957, 514–15.

46. Cf. Hardie 1993, 7. On the persistence of this image cf. Bartsch 1997, 16 n.13.

47. Cf. Danube (*BC* 3.202); Euphrates and Tigris (3.256–57); Styx (6.379).

48. Cf. Fantham 1992b on the Medusa excursus.

49. Cf. Eldred 2000, 65. *Caput* occurs in *BC* 9.700, 719, 739.

50. Cf. Fantham 1992b, 110 for the parallels between the Gorgon's head and Pompey's. Malamud 2003, 38–44 points out that Pompey's head symbolically invests Caesar with the powers of both Perseus and the Demiurge. Papaioannou 2005 emphasizes the Ovidian parallels in the Medusa passage. Richlin 1999, 203–4 discusses Cicero's head and points to the significance of decapitation as realization of the princeps' ability to control speech in the same way he controls the bodies of his subjects.

Moreover, Caesar exposes his head to new risks by getting involved in the Egyptian "civil war" between brother and sister, Cleopatra and Ptolemy. Already the first line of *BC* 10 indicates the dangers of Egypt as Caesar's pursuit of Pompey is here reduced to purely bodily terms; Caesar is on the search for Pompey's head (*BC* 10.1). In subsequent verses Lucan's concern for the head of Caesar nurtures the ancient rivalry between Rome and Alexandria for the role of *caput mundi.*

> *regnum Lagi Romana sub arma*
> *iret an eriperet mundo Memphiticus ensis*
> *victoris victique* ***caput***
>
> [would Lagus's kingdom (= Egypt) be subdued by Roman force, or would the sword of Memphis remove the **head** of conqueror and conquered from the world?] *(BC* 10.4–6)

Caesar thus embodies Rome, with his corporeal entity pledged as guarantee for Rome's supremacy. When the story of *BC* 10 unfolds, Pothinus and Achillas are driven to plot against Caesar's head out of fear for their own heads/lives.[51] Caesar's response to these attacks is to use Ptolemy as a human shield (*BC* 10.463–64). Earlier in his (mock-) lament for Pompey, Caesar had also contemplated decapitating Cleopatra as atonement for Pompey's death (*BC* 9.1070–71). A subsequent simile compares Caesar to Medea and Ptolemy to Absyrtus, rejigging the Medea myth as a tale of decapitation (*BC* 10.464–67).[52]

Following up the many ramifications of the play on *caput* in Lucan's epic, we have found that it is used in connection with mountains, rivers, winds, heavenly bodies, sacrificial intestines, the Gorgon and her snakes, the city of Rome, and most frequently Caesar and Pompey. This single word enables Lucan to create an entire image repertoire that transcends its immediacy and is meaningful on more than one level.[53] The word *caput* serves as trope for what is at stake in the *Bellum Civile.* For in this civil war many more than Pompey lose their *caput*: while Virgil's epic points toward the foundation of Rome and the bright future of Romans as *libera capita* (free citizens), Lucan reverses this process by giving a blow-by-blow account of the undoing of Rome, resulting in every citizen's deprivation of civil rights (*capitis deminutio*).

51. Cf. Pothinus and Achillas: *BC* 10.364–65; Caesar: *BC* 10.348 and 10.391–94.

52. On the different versions of Absyrtus's death in Greek and Latin literary tradition cf. Berti 2000 *ad* 10.464–67.

53. Esposito 1996, 100 n. 23 points to the frequency of words like *cervix* (neck) and *collum* (neck), which belong to the same semantic field as *caput* and enhance the repertoire of this imagery.

The Military Corps

In addition to actualizations of the rhetorical figure *pars pro toto*, where one part of the body stands in for the whole of the body, the semantics of body vocabulary also offer further possibilities for linking the human and the military body.[54] Scarry points out that the language of war tends to take injury away from individuals and relocates it to the imaginary body of a colossus (i.e., certain parts of an army can turn into an appendix, an underbelly, the Achilles' heel). This field, however, has so far largely remained unexamined.[55] Beard notes that *armus* is used poetically to refer to the human arm and points to the *Aeneid's* "ambiguity (or intentional play) with the neuter plural '*arma*' (in the sense of 'weapons')": *quam forti pectore et armis!* (How brave in heart and feats of arms! Virg. *Aen.* 4.11).[56] Lucan then develops this ambiguity inherent in vocabulary used to describe both the different parts of the body that soldiers can form and the human body. Accordingly, the word *arma*, which allows a play on arms and armory, tops the list of Lucan's most frequent body vocabulary with 187 occurrences. He is also exploiting the fact that words such as *manus* can mean "hand" as well as "armed force (of any size)," *ala* is the "upper arm" and at the same time "a wing or flank of an army," and *lacertus* denotes "upper arm" and "military strength."[57]

In the *Bellum Civile*, then, "the soldier's body is made to stand for the military "corps" itself."[58] In a mutiny Caesar is thus depicted as reduced to a mutilated *truncus* by the loss of his "hands," which represent his soldiers.

> *tot raptis **truncus manibus** gladioque relictus*
> *paene suo*
>
> [[Caesar] maimed by the loss of so many hands and almost left to his own sword] (*BC* 5.252–53)

Soon we find the same imagery of Caesar's army as a body with soldiers as its hands/troops applied again: *non pudet, heu, Caesar, soli tibi bella placere / iam*

---

54. Adams points to two instances in the *Aeneid* where a body part—here the heart (*pectora/corda*)—is used *pars pro toto* for *iuvenes* (young men). Cf. Adams 1982a, 42 on *Aen.* 2.349 and 5.729.

55. Scarry 1985, 70–72.

56. OLD s.v. *armus* 2. Cf. Beard 2002, 54 n. 13 on Virg. *Aen.* 4.11, 11.641 and 644.

57. OLD s.v. *manus* 1 and 22; s.v. *ala* 2 and 5; s.v. *lacertus* 1 and 2 with examples from a military context.

58. Bartsch 1997, 11, also 152 n. 12.

manibus *damnata tuis?* (Oh, does it not shame you, Caesar that you alone enjoy the wars now rejected by your **men**? *BC* 5.310–11].[59]

When taken in this way the decapitation of Pompey reads as a virtual suicide: one of the limbs of the leader's military body turns against him when he is killed by a former soldier (*BC* 8.606–8).[60] As a result, Pompey's floating headless *truncus* (*BC* 8.698–99) signifies both his actual death and the leaderless state of his fleet.

This imagery, however, is not reserved for military leaders alone. In an episode during the sea battle of Massilia (*BC* 3.603–26) the body (and corpse) of Lucan's unnamed hero becomes the shield of his twin brother and comrades. Not without bitter irony is the brother whose hands and arms have been chopped off positioned to protect with naked breast his brother's shield (*fraternaque pectore nudo arma tegens*, *BC* 3.619–20). In the end he turns his dying body into a weapon by using himself as a missile, attempting to sink an enemy boat. He thus compensates for his *armi* by using his body as *arma*.[61] This passage must be seen as an elaborated exploration of the double meanings of limbs, weapons, and forces.[62] The twin's body becomes an image of a battle within a battle in a civil war, a *mise en abyme* in a cosmos of violence. The language of dismemberment then construes a military battle in miniature, and this perspective opens up new ways of interpreting each soldier's fate as the graphic representation of an army's fate and simultaneously the fate of the Roman state body.

The Human Body

As seen from the examples of Arruns's sacrifice and the *matrona furens*, imagery of bodily malfunction is a recurrent topos in the precipitous first book of the *Bellum Civile*. It will accompany the reader through the rest of the poem. Lucan's strategy of body imagery, however, does not confine itself to assimilating the cosmic to the Roman state body. As observed in my section on the military corps, he also introduces the human body into this game. Accordingly, Crassus is depicted as a living bulwark, as personified *mora* (impediment) that

59. Postgate lists *Caesare toto* (*BC* 6.140 "all Caesar's forces") and *vix inpune suos inter convertitur enses* (= *suorum enses* "Hardly without injury can he turn among his comrades' swords," *BC* 4.779) as further manifestations of the military body. Cf. Postgate and Dilke 1978, *ad* 8.608. Conte 1988, 65, *ad* 6.140 cites also *iam totus adest in proelia Caesar* (now Caesar in all his might is here for battle, *BC* 5.742).

60. Bartsch 1997, 156 n. 56.

61. Cf. Metger 1970, 436 on *BC* 3.625 as *Mensch* without *Mensch-Sein*.

62. Cf. *BC* 3.616, where a *manus* (= hand/troop) is risked to get a *manus* back.

delays the war (*nam sola futuri / Crassus erat belli medius mora* "the only check to future war was Crassus in between," *BC* 1.99). The Latin enhances Crassus's in-between position through numerous hyperbata, and delays *mora* until the very end of the sentence. That Crassus's position is of global importance is demonstrated by the following simile, which depicts him as the Isthmus that keeps apart antagonistic seas (*BC* 1.100–102). The use of *fretum* (sea) in verse 1.102 seems deliberate and points to its ancient etymological connection with *ferventia* (fervor) and *fervor* (seething of troubled waters), a connotation that makes the sea an image of civil war *furor* (anger).[63] Both the previous and the following line use *mare* (sea), no sign of *aequor* (calm, flat sea) here, which is Lucan's most frequent choice for "sea." Lucan sustains this geographical imagery even further. After his death Crassus's blood leaves a memorable blot on the Roman map, tainting the name Carrhae forever (*Crassus / Assyrias Latio maculavit sanguine Carrhas* "Crassus stained Assyrian Carrhae with Latin blood," 1.104–5). In the Latin Crassus (in end position) seems to be replaced by the town Carrhae (in end position). In addition Lucan emphasises the antagonism between Romans and Parthians by contrasting them twice side by side at the beginning of subsequent verses: *Assyrias Latio* (*BC* 1.105) and *Parthica Romanos* (*BC* 1.106). With Crassus the former Isthmos has been swept away by war, Roman madness is unleashed, and there are no hyperbata any more that will keep the enemies apart.

The reader encounters Lucan's concept of the human body as barrier repeatedly throughout the epic. In a flashback on the Sullan civil war in *BC* 2 the dead bodies piling up in the Tiber form a dam that holds back the river's waters (*BC* 2.209–20). Similarly, categories blur when the tribune Metellus bravely confronts Caesar: a human body turns into a barrier to protect a building when a man is willing to use his body as defense wall (*BC* 3.117 and 3.141). Metellus's behavior exemplifies the "one for all" metaphor and subverts it into "one against all." In addition Lucan creates the impression of a military conflict by adorning Metellus's one-man army with battle vocabulary (***pugnax**que Metellus, / [. . .] **rapit** gressus et Caesaris **agmina rumpens*** "The aggressive Metellus rushes to break through Caesar's lines," *BC* 3.114–16). Later this concept is lived out to the full and inflated beyond plausibility by Scaeva's fighting in *BC 6*. Here a single man simultaneously is an army and fights against one (*BC* 6.191–92). Here to the reader's surprise the expression *Caesare toto* (all of Caesar's men), where the leader's name represents the force of his men, is actualized in *unus* (one alone), for Scaeva alone keeps Pompey's troops in check.[64]

63. Cf. Maltby 1991, 244.

64. Conte 1988, 65 *ad* 142 points to the contrast of *mille* and *unus.*

quem ***non mille*** *simul* ***turmis nec Caesare toto***
auferret Fortuna locum, victoribus ***unus*** *eripuit.*

[The place that Fortune could not win with a thousand squadrons or with Caesar's entire strength, a single man snatched from the victors.] (*BC* 6.140–41)

Moreover, Scaeva stands in for the tumbling wall of Caesar's camp and successfully takes its place: *stat non fragilis pro Caesare murus* (Firm he [Scaeva] stands, no frail wall in front of Caesar, *BC* 6.201).[65] Once boundaries are blurred, human bodies and human buildings become interchangeable.[66]

Lucan's avoidance of names at all costs can often be observed: as there is no virtue in civil war, no heroes can be named. Indeed Domitius Ahenobarbus's death is the only individual death at Pharsalus recorded by Lucan.[67] Nevertheless, this poetic program demands a certain inventiveness on Lucan's part as to which terms he employs to describe *personas agentes* (agents).[68] Hence the predominance of the words *manus* (hand) and *dextra* (right hand) among the body vocabulary of the *Bellum Civile*: Lucan lets an army of countless and anonymous hands fight, murder, and kill; remarkably independent body parts perform deeds that sturdy heroes would normally enact and thus serve as substitute agents. For this reason expressions for joining battle such as *miscere manus* (lit. "mixing hands," *BC* 4.773) form part of a larger project that pushes body imagery to the forefront.[69] As we will see, *BC* 7 in particular is a treasure trove for instances of self-animated hands that guarantee the anonymity necessary to tell of unspeakable civil war. The key function of *manus* can already be observed at the word's first occurrence: *in te verte* ***manus*** (turn your hand against yourself, *BC* 1.23) accurately describes the workings of civil war. Indeed hands are this epic's driving force. Even Caesar is introduced and characterized as ever-ready, troops and sword always at hand (*BC* 1.146–47). Throughout the

65. On wall imagery in *BC* 6 cf. Saylor 1978, 244.

66. Scaeva also turns parts of the defunct wall he substitutes with his body into weapons; the enemies respond with their own wall of human bodies, which finally equals Caesar's wall in height (*BC* 6.180–81).

67. Ahl 1976, 50. Cf. Sklenar 2003, 20–21 on the anonymity of *virtus* in Lucan's battle scenes.

68. Hübner 1972, 577 remarks that in the *Bellum Civile* the figure of hypallage is often employed to represent dead and motionless objects in living and independent motion.

69. Cf. *miscenturque manus* (hand meets hand [in battle], *BC* 3.569), *invenient haec arma manus* (the weapons will find hands [to hold them], *BC* 5.326); *nulla fuit non certa manus* (every hand was surely aimed, *BC* 6.190). Lucan sustains this imagery also to denote absence. Cf. *desuntque manus poscentibus arvis* (lacking the hands for fields that demand them, *BC* 1.29); *ignavae liquere manus* ([Rome] was abandoned by cowardly throngs, *BC* 1.514).

Bellum Civile, play on the two meanings of the word *manus* = "hand" but also "troop" never ceases, as some examples will demonstrate:

> *haec* ***manus,*** *ut victum post terga relinqueret orbem,*
> *Oceani tumidas remo compescuit undas*
>
> [To leave a conquered world behind as it marched on, this army (or arm) subdued with oar the Ocean's swollen waves.] (*BC* 1.369–70)

In addition, repeatedly the troops pledge their hands—the wordplay consists of the fact that *cohortes* = *manus*:

> *his cunctae simul assensere cohortes*
> *elatasque alte, quaecumque ad bella vocaret,*
> *promisere* ***manus***
>
> [With these words all the cohorts agreed together, and they pledged their hands, lifted high, to fight wherever he [Caesar] summoned them.] (*BC* 1.386–88)

Lucan grows so fond of this pun that I must confine myself to quoting just a selection. In *BC* 2 we meet the Massilians, a people who are unwarlike. Translated into body imagery this means they are hands whose arms do not support them:

> *numquam felicibus* ***armis***
> *usa* ***manus,*** *patriae primis a sedibus exul.*
>
> [Never have we used weapons prosperously, exiles from our country's first abodes.] (*BC* 3.338–39)

The ultimate pun occurs when Lucan comments on Caesar's "mighty hands" knocking at Amyclas's door after the über-storm scene in *BC* 5. The military subtext is hard to miss:

> *haec Caesar bis terque* ***manu*** *quassantia tectum*
> *limina commovit*
>
> [Twice and three time with his hand Caesar struck this threshold, shaking the roof.] (*BC* 5.519–20)

In addition these verses followed by

> *quibus hoc contingere templis*
> *aut potuit muris, nullo trepidare tumult*
> *Caesarea pulsante manu?*
>
> [Which temples or which walls could enjoy this blessing, not to shake in panic when Caesar's hand is knocking?] (*BC* 5.529–31)

In short, hands stand in for many a character. The city Ilerda is founded "by ancient hand" (*BC* 4.12–13), and when Caesar's soldiers stage a mutiny, their hands stop short of nothing: *nil actum est bellis, si nondum comperit istas / **omnia posse manus*** (Nothing have the wars achieved if he (Caesar) has not yet learnt that our hands can do anything, *BC* 5.287–88). In sum, civil war could only be prevented when all hands were kept busy with foreign foes (*BC* 2.54–56).

My summary analysis demonstrates how Lucan's recurrent use of body imagery serves to connect the human and the military body with that of the Roman state and the cosmic body. As a result this blend conjures up an apocalyptic vision of bodies suffering the pains of civil war. Through this trope, in all its multilayered versatility, body imagery becomes a ringing leitmotif of Lucan's deconstruction of the Roman republic.

The Textual Body

Mutilation and dismemberment in Imperial Latin poetry correlates with this literature's style of writing and grammatical liberty.[70] When the word itself is at war,[71] when sentences and grammatical structures are chopped up, the vivisection of the human body functions as a translation or realization of literary into corporeal imagery. Here once more literature has found a way to tell us how it is composed.

Lucan's episodic style has shaped his textual body as an epic with many *capita* (sections);[72] at the same time, however, the author initiates its decomposition by leaving it in the form of a headless trunk. When each episode, each verse of the *Bellum Civile* articulates a limb of the poetic body, it is not least

70. Cf. Most 1992, 407–9; Quint 1993, 142–43.
71. A slogan coined by Henderson 1987.
72. Cf. OLD s.v. *caput* 18 citing instances from Varro and Cicero.

Lucan's rhetorical style, his unceasing struggle for the most memorable expression, that guarantees his afterlife—through excerptability.[73]

What is more, Lucan is constantly in search of an embodiment of himself and his poetics in the *Bellum Civile*.[74] Frequent interjections by the poetic voice throughout the epos insistently remind the reader of the shadowy presence of the poet.[75] And at times—most famously with *Pharsalia nostra vivet* (our Pharsalia shall live, *BC* 9.985)—we witness how the author strives to embalm himself within his poetry and attempts to preserve his fame in his body of poetry. Referring to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Farrell states that "between the beginning and the end, the birth and death, of this particular *corpus,* we glimpse an evolving image of the poetic body, an image that culminates in Ovid's liberation from his bookish *corpus* into a poetic afterlife as disembodied voice."[76] Lucan, however, less detached from his poetic body, studiously writes himself into his poetic *corpus* and connects his fate with that of the *Bellum Civile*.[77] Mindful of the ancient biographical tradition, we may be tempted to read his epic as his epitaph, composed by a young poet facing his doom.[78]

In his discussion of Rabelais's novel *Gargantua and Pantagruel* Bakhtin formulates the dichotomy between a closed and open body ideal. In its closed form "the body was first of all a strictly completed, finished product. Furthermore, it was isolated, alone, fenced off from all other bodies. All signs of its unfinished character, of its growth and proliferation were eliminated."[79] In contrast, "the unfinished and open body (dying, bringing forth and being born) is not separated from the world by clearly defined boundaries; it is blended with the world, with animals, with objects. It is cosmic, it represents the entire material bodily world in all its elements."[80] There is not a single closed body in Lucan's epic, as his layered and rich body imagery continually calls attention to the dynamic interaction of body and world. By presenting his epic body not as a

73. Cf. Seckendorff 1695 for a Renaissance reading of Lucan's epic as a treasury for proverbs and chapter 3 on Lucan's *sententiae.*

74. Masters 1992 points out poet figures in the *Bellum Civile.* Lee 2005 unearths links between physical and sensual details of authors and the "body" of their work.

75. Braund 1992, xlix counts 144 interjections.

76. Farrell 1999, 133. Theodorakopoulos 1999, 151 sees Ovid's transformation as an exit from a world of suffering. Here the author manages to escape the anxiety associated by Lacan with a fragmented body (*corps morcelé*).

77. Farrell 1999, 131 points to the Roman tendency "to view the book as a physical analogue of the author's body."

78. For biographical readings of the *Bellum Civile* cf. Pfligersdorffer 1959. Ker 2009 explores the literary traces of the death of Lucan's uncle Seneca.

79. Bakhtin 1984, 29. Bakhtin exemplifies this with material from the Middle Ages. Booker 1995, 25 finds this concept illustrated by the Greek statues that Bloom eyes in the Irish National Museum in James Joyce's *Ulysses*.

80. Bakhtin 1984, 26–27.

classical whole but as an open body, a vivisection of the Roman republic, Lucan once more calls the authority of epic into question and "exposes the cracks and fissures in a genre that seeks to pass itself off as a seamless whole."[81]

Chapters 2 and 3 of this study will further exploit the dichotomy between Lucan's open textual body and the desire for lasting fame that is written into it, while the fourth chapter will examine how Lucan's epic body copes with the repetition and revision written into it.

In this outline I have established the omnipresence of body imagery in Lucan's epic and examined the function of this imagery on different levels throughout the text. For the cosmic body Lucan uses gigantomachic imagery and personification to invest earth and heaven, most prominently the sun, with bodily presences, which enable them to take an active part in crafting his world of civil war. Second, the Roman state body is drawn into Lucan's project: throughout, *Roma* carries virtual bodily presence, and extensive play on the manifold meanings of *caput* positions strife for the *caput mundi* at the very heart of the epic. Third, in the military corps the bodies of the military leaders and that of the armies seem to merge, one representing the other. What is more, overlap of military and body vocabulary makes us read each soldier as epitomizing a larger body. Additionally, human bodies frequently stand in for soulless objects, are piled up and turned into defensive structures—guarding rather than being guarded. Lucan's poetics of namelessness relies heavily on substituting body parts such as *manus* for named characters when denoting those committing *nefas*. Finally, Lucan frequently links his fate and fame with that of his textual body and thus designs these *funera mundi* as his own requiem. In sum, Lucan's interlocking of different levels of often disturbing body imagery creates an epic body that is not whole and closed but unnervingly unfinished and open. Nevertheless, paradoxically Lucan writes himself and his desire for lasting fame into his epic corpus. In the following two sections, then, I shall showcase the workings of Lucan's body imagery.

Reading Corporeality in *Bellum Civile* 7

Around his epic Lucan scatters battle scenes displaying a wealth of body imagery. Pharsalus in *BC 7*, however, constitutes the decisive military encounter in the *Bellum Civile*. In many respects it is the heart to which the veins of body language flow that run through the epic *corpus*. In what follows, I demonstrate

81. Booker 1995, 25. He employs the concept of the open and closed body to discuss Joyce's view of Homer.

how the different levels of corporeality that I have explored so far interact here. A close reading of *BC* 7 will reveal how Lucan employs body imagery to present his version of the battle at Pharsalus.

Lucan opens *BC* 7 with a view of the Emathian stage from the cosmic perspective. On the day of the battle of Pharsalus the sun embodies the poet's hesitation to tell his story of *nefas* (sacrilege), and *BC* 7.1–2 thus becomes an image of Lucan's poetic concept of *mora* (delay).[82] Accordingly, the pallid sun is a symptom of war, but also heralds civil war all over the world (*BC* 7.199–200). Sunlight, then, is described in such militant terms that it seems to be taking part in the conflict itself.[83]

Second, Pompey's dream (*BC* 7.7–20*)* reconfirms him as an important member of the Roman state body by looking back to his happiest days. This is followed immediately by a last encounter between Roma and Pompey. The two are depicted as a loving yet doomed couple (7.29–32). Like Cornelia, Pompey's "real" wife, Rome too, will not even be allowed to tend the grave of her beloved (*BC* 7.35–36). Pompey for his part has done his best to keep Rome's body unscathed: *testor Roma [. . .]: potuit tibi* ***volnere nullo*** */ stare labor belli* (But I call on you to witness, Rome [. . .]: the toil of war could have cost you no wound, *BC* 7.91–93. Rome's grief is then transferred onto and multiplied by the people of Rome (*BC* 7.37–44): her inhabitants stand for the city. After his defeat, however, Pompey parts with Rome, and separates his fate from hers (7.659–61). He shifts focus to his wife Cornelia (7.661–62); she becomes his new Rome (8.133).

In *BC* 6 Lucan introduces the reader to Thessaly's topography of war. With the story of the exiled Agaue he illustrates vividly how Thessaly is indeed the place to bring and bury a head (6.357–58). Unsurprisingly, then, we find that the play on *caput* that I sketched out above continues throughout *BC* 7.

Ahead of the battle of Pharsalus the Republican party, forged from the remains of the Roman state body, desires to rush "**headlong**" into combat: *sua quisque ac publica fata /* ***praecipitare*** *cupit* (each desires to precipitate his own fate and the state's, *BC* 7.51–52).[84] At this occasion Cicero functions as the voice of the Roman Republic and at this decisive moment he points out the danger that the military body is about to act on its own, as if headless (*BC* 7.62–65),[85] not as named individuals but as an indistinguishable mass of soldiers embod-

82. Cf. Hübner 1976 on this passage.

83. Cf. *miles, ut* ***adverso*** *Phoebi radiatus ab* ***ictu*** */ descendens* (the troops, as they descended, radiant from Phoebus's beams facing them, *BC* 7.214–15). In a similar vein the daylight "triumphs" over the stars: *vicerat astra iubar* (day's first light had overcome the stars, *BC* 7.45).

84. In addition to two occurrences of the verb *praecipitare* (to rush headlong), *BC* 7 features also seven instances of the word *praeceps*, a record for the *Bellum Civile.*

85. Cf. also *ipsae tua signa revellent / prosilientque acies* (Of their own accord, the ranks will tear your standards up and spring forward, *BC* 7.77–78).

ied by anonymous hands that brandish weapons (*vibrant tela* ***manus,*** *BC* 7.82). Pompey, however, hesitates to make the move from citizen to soldier (*BC* 7.85–89). Even though the leader is willing to sacrifice his own head to prevent war, the success of his party remains ever more bound to his unscathed body (*BC* 7.117–19 and 671–72). Pompey's *caput* guarantees not only his individual life but has come to represent the state, the *res Romana.*

Caesar, as well, stands in for his army with his body: in their eagerness to start battle Pompey's soldiers demand to wet their swords with Caesar's blood (7.81). Similarly Caesar links his personal fate—literally his head and body—with the success of his army when spelling out the dire consequences of his soldiers' potential failure: *et* ***caput*** *hoc positum rostris effusaque* ***membra*** (this head of mine placed upon the Rostra [= speakers' corner in Rome], my limbs flung far and wide, *BC* 7.305).

At the very outset of his epic Lucan depicts civil war as Rome's suicide (*BC* 1.3), an image echoed and multiplied by numerous suicides throughout the epic. Caesar, however compresses this imagery into a grand formula: it is either Rome—embodied by Pompey's army—or Caesar that must perish. For Caesar pledges his suicide if his cause is lost: *fodientem* ***viscera*** *cernet / me mea qui nondum victo respexerit hoste* (the man who looks behind before the enemy is conquered will see me stabbing my own guts, *BC* 7.308–9). Accordingly, the demise of Caesar's military body will result in and be paralleled by the decomposition of Caesar's actual body. Through his fiery speech he thus hopes to direct his soldiers' hands, hands that hold his fate: *in* ***manibus*** *vestris,* ***quantus sit Caesar,*** *habetis* (How great will Caesar be?—in your hands it lies, *BC* 7.253).[86] In accordance with the drastic polarization of Rome and Caesar, the latter has become the enemy of the entire world, of all humankind (*BC* 7.72–73). Caesar, however, wins his duel with Rome: his power becomes explicit by his domination of Rome's body, the body of the state, when at the end of the battle he is shown wading through the innards of his fatherland literally trampling on them: *tu, Caesar, in alto / caedis adhuc cumulo patriae per* ***viscera*** *vadis, / at tibi iam populos donat gener* (Caesar, you are walking still in a lofty heap of slaughter through the guts of your fatherland, but to you your son-in-law already grants the nations, *BC* 7.721–23).

What is more, the leaders' heads remain of vital importance—standing in at times for the names of their owners (Caesar: 7.451; Pompey: 7.712–13 and 7.674–75). In the end, however, to our surprise, it is an unknown that decides

86. Pharsalus is a decisive day that will define the world: *advenisse diem qui fatum rebus in aevum / conderet humanis, et quaeri* ***Roma quid esset*** */ illo Marte, palam est* (It is clear that the day has come that will establish the destiny of human life for ever, that the battle will decide what Rome will be, *BC* 7.131–33).

the battle: the sight of a horseman thrown off "headlong" and crushed causes the entire cavalry to turn to flight (7.525–31).[87]

Furthermore *BC* 7 is a treasure trove for instances of self-animated hands, which guarantee the anonymity necessary for a tale of civil war (*BC* 7.82, 7.462–63). Lucan's epic shares this preference with Caesar's, Appian's, and Cassius Dio's civil war accounts. Ash observes that the latter "tend to elide the differences between civil war armies, particularly in battle descriptions. Neither [. . .] tries to reconstruct in any detail what individual soldiers, or groups of such men within a larger unit, might be thinking or feeling."[88] No hand, however, can remain pure in civil war, so Lucan points out repeatedly: ***nulla manus*** *belli mutato iudice* ***pura*** *est* (Once the judge of war is changed, no hand is clean, *BC* 7.263).[89] Fittingly, then, Crastinus's hand (for once an identified one) starts the actual combat;[90] Lucan's interjection *O* ***praeceps*** *rabies*! (O impetuous frenzy! *BC* 7.474) laments a world rushing to war headlessly and indicates the lack of control by Caesar, the actual head of this operation. Adding to the general sense of headlessness, the bull about to be sacrificed before the battle runs away, hurling himself headlong into the fields of Emathia (7.165–66). As before in *BC* 2, where Arruns's sacrificial victim embodies the Roman state, we find the action of the military body anticipated by a smaller corporeal entity.

What is more, *manus* becomes synonymous with "soldier." As the word *manus* can denote both a body part and a small military unit, this allows for extensive play upon the military and the human body.[91] Which "hand" would dare to tremble with Caesar watching? (*inspicit [. . .] / quae presso tremat ense* ***manus*** He [Caesar] inspects which hand trembles as it grasps the sword, *BC* 7.560–62). In addition Lucan turns Caesar into the ultimate soldier, an omnipresent "hand" (*ipse manu, BC* 7.567 and 574), the incarnation of war, likened to *Bellona* (7.568) and Mars (569). Caesar then with his "hands" attacks the empire's vitals when directing his troops toward the members of the senate.

---

87. Lucan here plays with the reader by spelling out *praecipites* (translated as "in headlong flight" by Postgate and Dilke 1978 *ad loc*) with *in caput effusi* (threw its rider on its head) before hammering this point home with *praeceps* (headlong) once more in the same sentence.

88. Ash 1999, 21.

89. Cf. also *optat pars [. . .] / ac* ***puras*** *servare* ***manus*** (some long [. . .] to keep their hands undefiled, *BC* 7.486–88). On Lucan's poetics of repetition cf. ch. 4.

90. Cf. *Crastine [. . .], / cuius torta* ***manu*** *commisit lancea bellum* (Crastinus, whose hand hurled the lance that started war, *BC* 7.472).

91. Cf. *civilia paucae / bella* ***manus*** *facient* (Few hands of yours will wage war against fellow Romans, *BC* 7.274–75); sed *me Fortuna meorum / commisit* ***manibus*** (But Fortune has entrusted me to my own men's hands, *BC* 7.285–86) spoken by Caesar; *innumeraeque urbes, quantas in proelia numquam, / excivere* ***manus*** (Innumerable cities stirred to battle hordes in number never seen before, *BC* 7.362–63); *saevasque* ***manus*** *inmittit in hostem* ([Pompey's light-armed troops] launch their savage bands against the enemy, *BC* 7.509). Five instances of *manus* in 30 verses (*BC* 7.549–78) exploit this versatility further.

in plebem vetat ire ***manus*** *monstratque senatum:*
scit ***cruor imperii*** *qui sit, quae* ***viscera rerum***

[[Caesar] forbids them to strike the masses and indicates the Senate; well he knows which is the empire's blood, which are the guts of the state.] (*BC* 7.578–79)[92]

A further facet of body language whose versatility Lucan exploits in the course of his epic centers on the words *facies/vultus* (face). The poet employs the term on several levels, cosmic and human, to serve his body politics. Accordingly, not only do we encounter a multitude of disfigured human faces throughout the *Bellum Civile* but in addition Lucan takes up Manilius's juncture *facies caeli* (the aspect/face of heaven, Man. 4.915–16) to invest the heavens with bodily features. Heaven's appearance, "the sky's disfigured face" (***deformis caeli facies***, *BC* 4.105) is thus in line with one of the leitmotifs of the battle at Pharsalus, where disfigured faces guarantee that the victims of the battle remain anonymous. This eliminates *nefas*, the killing of kin by kin, from civil war. The motif of the disfigured face advances to the status of a *sine qua non* of civil war.[93] In the end Lucan's crescendo of facial mutilation culminates in a scene that contains a ringing act of decapitation of brother by brother (*BC* 7.626–30)—pointing us once more to Pompey's death.[94]

Lucan frequently evokes the cosmic body to create the notion of a "world in pieces," a *sympatheia* of all the different levels of body imagery.[95] We witness not only the clashing of armies but also the clashing of mountains. As so often in the *Bellum Civile* word order here enhances violent content: in the Latin the names of Mt. Olympus and Mt. Pindus oppose each other side by side; *multis concurrere visus* ***Olympo / Pindus*** (to many people Pindus seems to collide with Olympus, *BC* 7.174–75). In addition we also regularly encounter waters tainted by (Roman) blood. In *BC* 2 the Tiber consists of blood and bodies only (*BC* 2.211 and 2.214–16). Similarly, at the naval battle of Massilia the sea turns into blood (*BC* 3.572–73 and 3.576–77). It appears not unlike a body that is wounded

92. Leigh 1997, 209 n. 50 points to the body-of-state imagery employed here. Throughout, the senate is perceived as a single body that can be attacked; cf. *sparsumque* ***senatus*** / ***corpus*** (the Senate's mangled body, *BC* 7.293–94).

93. In addition a series of disfigured faces from previous military combats shows us the "other" side, that of the defeated, whose relatives search for them among the dead bodies. Cf. *caesi* ***deformia*** *fratris / ora* (my slain brother's disfigured face [in Rome's previous civil war], *BC* 2.169–70); ***confusis vultibus*** (with features mangled [after the sea battle at Massilia], *BC* 3.758).

94. Cf. ***vultus*** *gladio* ***turbate*** *verendos* (Disfigure with your sword the faces that demand respect, *BC* 7.322); *adversosque iubet ferro* ***confundere vultus*** (He [Caesar] orders them to mangle with their steel the faces of the enemy, *BC* 7.575).

95. A slogan coined by Henderson 1998b.

(*BC* 3.580–82). Occasionally Lucan can even fall back on already established body imagery for the anatomy of rivers, as is the case with the veins of the Nile (OLD *vena* 5b and *BC* 10.325). Even though streams of blood run through the entire epic, in *BC* 7 in particular this kind of imagery contributes to Lucan's projection of an all-encompassing body that meets its end at Pharsalus (*BC* 7.116, 7.174–76, and 7.700).[96] While before rivers turned into blood, at Pharsalus blood turns into rivers (*BC* 7.292 and 7.635–37). Finally, the streams of blood, which before the battle Caesar only imagines, turn into reality (*BC* 7.789–90). Pompey for his part attempts to disengage from his military body on his flight. But it manages to catch up with him when he encounters a river of soldierly blood (*BC* 8.33–34). During the battle of Pharsalus Lucan uses a simile depicting the Roman body as ship of state in a storm.[97] Overall these descriptions introduce and enhance the notion that all bodies await the same fate at Pharsalus, that all become one.

In succession the cosmic body employs its own forces to oppose humans: meteors, flame, cyclones, and lightning all find their target (*BC* 7.152–57). Lucan's announcement at the very outset of *BC* 7 that war will come from anywhere and everywhere turns real (*BC* 7.27). Moreover, his strategy of writing all the different bodies of his epic into one in *BC* 7 marshals all-encompassing expressions such as *sanguis mundi* (the world's blood, *BC* 7.233), with the result that the world materializes as one bodily entity, which can be cut down with a single stroke: *et primo ferri motu prosternite mundum* (and with your sword's first stroke lay low the world! *BC* 7.278). The forest dripping with blood and the rain of gore at the end of *BC* 7 form the climax of this fusion of bodies (*BC* 7.836–40).

Moreover, the world of the *Bellum Civile* is a Roman universe in which Rome means the world. The sun and the stars see nothing but Roman land (*BC* 7.421–25). This allows Lucan to equate *urbs* (city) and *orbis* (globe) when designing his *funera mundi*; the fall of Rome must thus imply apocalypse. In the same way that Rome and the cosmos form a unity, Pompey explicitly recognizes the ties between his military corps and his own body when he identifies himself with the soldiers fighting and dying in battle.

tot telis sua fata peti, sua corpora fusa
ac se tam multo pereuntem sanguine vidit

---

96. Moreover Lucan applies *Blut und Boden* ideology to Pharsalus (*BC* 7.535–40).

97. Similes: ship of state (*BC* 7.125–27); apocalypse (7.134–37); gigantomachy (7.145–50); Miura 1983 points to the parallels between the similes of *BC* 1 and *BC* 7. Both books describe the symptoms of civil war on all levels.

> [He [Pompey] saw so many weapons aimed at his own death, so many bodies laid low and himself dying in so much blood.] (*BC* 7.652–53)

Consequently with the Roman and the cosmic body going hand in hand, Lucan can finally seal their downfall in that of Pompey's body, which signifies at once human corpus and military corps.

In addition we are constantly reminded of Hercules' role as demiurge in the creation of Thessaly, his shaping of the cosmic body. Pompey is thus placed in a landscape, which has been modeled by his divine patron. Lucan plays on this notion when he suggests (in solemn spondees) using wood from Mt. Oeta for the cremation of those of Pompey's soldiers who fell at Pharsalus (*BC* 7.806–8). In the reader Lucan thus evokes Hercules and his funeral pyre on this very mountain. Furthermore, Lucan immediately widens his image of the funeral pyre into the cosmic perspective of global conflagration: *communis mundo superest rogus ossibus astra / mixturus* (A shared funeral pyre that will mingle stars with dead men's bones awaits the universe, *BC* 7.814–15). Although Caesar denies burial to the dead bodies, they will in the end decompose and in that way return to nature (*BC* 7.810–11). Lucan introduces here the notion of the world as man's grave, a notion that will materialize again in the case of Pompey's death: *capit omnia tellus / quae genuit; caelo tegitur, qui non habet urnam* (The man who has no funeral urn is covered by the sky, *BC* 7.818–19.) In a way Pompey's soldiers fallen at Pharsalus parallel their commander's own end in their lack of funerary rites and in their final fusion with the cosmic body.[98]

During battle the landscape of Pharsalus is carpeted with corpses. Caesar no longer walks on the ground but wades through heaps of dead bodies, which taken together form the prostrate Roman body on whose inner organs he tramples.[99] After the battle Caesar does not shrink from coming face-to-face with Pharsalus, where a landscape shaped by death presents itself (*BC* 7.786–94 and 7.597–98). In the same way he later eagerly takes in Pompey's *caput*, too: *vultus, dum crederet, haesit* (he lingered till he could believe the face, *BC* 9.1036). The civil war goes on and is translated back into landscape when the dead bodies succeed in conquering Thessaly: *sed tibi tabentes populi Pharsalica rura / eripiunt camposque tenent victore fugato* (But the rotting hordes rob you [Caesar] of Pharsalian fields; they rout the conqueror and possess the plains, *BC* 7.823–24). Indeed they are totally

98. Masters 1992, 26–27 points to the burning ramparts of Massilia as a further example of an anticipation of Pompey's funeral, the funeral he will never have.

99. Cf. *BC* 7.721, quoted above. This image is a violent refashioning of Caesar walking quietly through his military corps caught by sleep, brother of death (*BC* 5.510–12). We are also reminded of Erictho's promenade among the dead (*BC* 6.625–26) and the unidentified narrator's search among the dead in a previous civil war (*BC* 2.172–73).

absorbed and incorporated by this site: Thessaly becomes the grave of the Roman people (*BC* 7.845–46 and 7.861–62). As a result, this conglomeration of cosmic, human, military, Roman, and literary body emerges as a place of memory—a scar etched into the Roman body: *quod sufficit aevum / immemor ut donet belli tibi damna vetustas?* (What length of time will be enough for distant ages to forget and to forgive you for the losses of the war? *BC* 7.849–50).[100]

Throughout the epic the reader is inundated with examples of bodies violated by war. As we have seen, Lucan constructs the vivisection of the Roman body in BC 7 by bringing together all its parts in the battle of Pharsalus. Accordingly Pharsalus becomes a place where individuality is lost and where the soldiers meld into one body. There Lucan's memorable image of the Roman body turning against itself in suicide (BC 1.2–3) is readily translated into the destructive forces of a military body in which brothers are fighting against brothers and sons against fathers.[101] Along these lines Lucan perceives the battle of Pharsalus as the suicide of the Roman Republic. The text focuses upon the bodies of the two leaders and translates them into military action. To achieve this, Lucan employs recurrent play on words such as *caput* (head) and *manus* (hand). Furthermore, the Roman and the cosmic body are equated. They are then employed together to globalize civil war as *funera mundi* (apocalypse). In spite of this, among all the corpses Lucan's voice sounds out, pleading for his own immortality and writing himself into his epic corpus.

> *haec et apud seras gentes populosque nepotum,*
> *sive sua tantum venient in saecula fama*
> *sive aliquid magnis* ***nostri quoque cura laboris***
> *nominibus prodesse potest, cum bella legentur,*
> *spesque metuque simul perituraque vota movebunt*
>
> [Even among later races and the people of posterity, these events—whether they come down to future ages by their own fame alone or whether my devotion also and my toil can do anything for mighty names—will stir both hopes and fears together and useless prayers when the battle is read.] (*BC* 7.207–11).

This dichotomy between wounded open body that Lucan creates for the reader, and his ambition for lasting fame I shall explore further in what follows. In ad-

100. On scars and memory places cf. n. 13. Tatum 2003 offers a veteran's perspective on epic fighting.

101. Cf. *BC* 7.464–65 and 7.181–83. Subconsciously the soldiers and Caesar continue the conflict even when they are sleeping. Cf. *BC* 7.764–65 and Caesar's dream, 7.781–83.

dition Lucan not only writes in the aftermath of the *Aeneid* but also of Ovid's *Metamorphoses.* His opened up and fragmented literary body with its many mutilations owes much to Ovid's exploitation and advancement of Latin body language. As there is no language to describe the pain and ailing of a state body in transition from Republic to Principate, Lucan transfers this suffering onto different levels of body imagery. We are thus witnessing the metamorphosis of the Roman Republic into Imperial Rome, a metamorphosis whose pains are manifest in body imagery represented through many bodies. According to Lucan after civil war, Rome will be a new body, a Rome without Romans, a shadow of a name, in which the Roman Republic is a mere memory.[102]

> *nulloque frequentem*
> *cive suo Romam sed mundi faece repletam*
> *cladis eo dedimus, ne tanto in* ***corpore*** *bellum*
> *iam possit civile geri*
>
> [And Rome, crowded by no citizen of her own but filled with the dregs of the world, we have consigned to such a depth of ruin that in a body so immense civil war cannot now be waged.] (*BC* 7.404–7)

Scribes less attentive to the epic's body imagery than this study have proposed reading *tempore* (time) for *corpore* (body) in this passage (*BC* 7.406).

In what follows a case study of one particularly memorable body motif shall now showcase Ovid's influence on Lucan's body imagery.

And Yet It Moves: The Automatism of the Cut-Off Body Part—a Case Study

Dead human bodies on the move, or even only their parts, tend to horrify and disgust us. Contrary to our modern taste, the Latin epicists confront their readership with ever more detailed descriptions of violence, injuries, and wounds. Through his statistical survey Most has proven the "overwhelming preference among all epic poets for puncture wounds"; he also points out that the cases of more serious injuries such as amputations and their detailed depiction are on the rise in Lucan (this might well be true for Ovid's *Metamophoses,* too).[103] For these the dismemberment of animals at sacrificial rites and human beings

102. For Rome destined to be peopled with foreigners cf. also *BC* 7.540–43. Gowing 2005 deals with the result of civil war: the memory of the Roman Republic lingering on in the imperial state body.

103. Cf. Most 1992, 398–400; Segal 1998, 32.

at circus shows has been suggested as possible inspiration.[104] At the same time the staginess of epic literature and epic's consciousness of an audience have attracted much scholarly attention.[105] It seems surprising, then, to find that these depictions of cruelty increasingly feature hyperrealistic functions of the human body, which the authors cannot have observed in the arena, as they are physically impossible. On the one hand these hyperrealisms can be interpreted as an attempt to outdo the more conventional circus spectacles on a literary basis. On the other the epic successors' increasing delight in gruesome detail also reveals their intention to trump their poetic predecessors. Accordingly, many scholars have associated the depiction of violence with the baroque embellishment of decadent Imperial Latin literature.[106] Only recently has violence been rehabilitated.[107] My concern in this section will be to improve the bad reputation of the poets' fondness for dismembered body parts in particular and to showcase the development of an epic motif.

The traditional aim of bloodshed in epic is to put emphasis on the prowess of a single hero. He fights against condemned throngs of minor heroes, which in this way obtain a characterizing function in the plot.[108] This suits the literary worlds of the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*, in which social boundaries are still firmly defined.[109] From Ovid onward, however, cruelty seems mainly to provide variation, entertainment, or contrast with the surrounding scenes.[110] This lack of apparent motivation and function finds its formal counterpart in so-called isolated scenes.[111] These then finally develop into detailed and intensive visions of terror in Lucan and Seneca. Here the hero turns into a Stoic *contrapost*, who suffers his injuries and mutilations in emotionless silence. His blood smooths the way for the early Christian delight in martyrdom and asceticism.[112]

Then and now audiences would only be able to absorb a certain amount of bloodshed before the shock factor ebbed and they would be watching out

---

104. Cf. Most 1992, 401; Coleman 1990 on the interaction of circus and literature; Foucault 1979, 7–10 sees torture as public spectacle; for public medical vivisections cf. Selinger 1999, 32.

105. Cf. Rosati 1983, 95; Feldherr 1998, 4–18; Leigh 1997.

106. Cf. Regenbogen 1930 and the discussion in Segal 1984, 312.

107. Cf. Most 1992 and Segal 1998.

108. Cf. Strasburger 1954; for recent approaches to epic catalogs cf. Gaßner 1972, Kühlmann 1973, and Reitz 1999.

109. Cf. Finley 1964, ch. 5 and Haubold 2000, 110.

110. An exception is the flaying of Marsyas (*Met.* 6.441–70), where violence certainly serves to motivate revenge, but—as we will see—it also serves other purposes. Ovid's change in attitude toward traditional heroism can be seen in his avoidance of an *aristeia* of Perseus in *Met.* 5.177–209; cf. Segal 1985, Nagle 1988, and Keith 1999.

111. Cf. Fuhrmann 1968, 66 (*isolierte Szenen/Einzelszenen*).

112. Cf. Prudentius *Psychomachia*, Clark 1998, and illustrations 9, 17, and 46–55 in Spivey 2001. For the delight in the macabre in the 16th and 17th centuries cf. Bouteille-Meister and Aukrust 2010.

for new pleasures elsewhere.[113] The most memorable mutilations, however, the automatisms of cut-off body parts, clearly mark themselves off from the surrounding violence by their hyperrealism; we may presume that the audience takes notice of them. As I shall demonstrate, precisely this quality lets them become preferred vehicles for metapoetics. Lucan's reworking in the death of Marius (*BC* 2.181–84), of Philomela's mutilation in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Oedipus's self-blinding in Senecan tragedy will stand as striking examples.[114] Furthermore, violation and fragmentation of a human body can prompt us to step back and reflect on the meaning and significance of the body in its entirety. In Lucan's epic the soldier Murrus exemplifies this when he watches a part of himself, his hand, die in the Libyan desert (*BC* 9.830–33).

In epic, the mutilation of an enemy builds up the *kleos* (fame) of the active mutilator. At the same time, however, it also defines the (final) *kleos* of the passive mutilated, which can be analyzed in retrospective after his death. The automatism of the cut-off body part thus disturbs the solemn fulfillment of a heroic fate by blurring the border between life and death. In what follows, we will find that the limbs' insistence on an (after)life puts much more emphasis on expressing a final "*vivam*" (I shall live on) than on grotesque deconstruction, for these scenes are indeed there to be remembered.[115]

Toward Ovid

The epic motif of the automatism of the cut-off body part has its roots in short appearances in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (*Il.* 10.457 = *Od.* 22.329, heads) and finds its Latin successors in cautious lines by Ennius (*Ann.* 483–84 Skutsch [head] = Servius on *Aen.* 10.396) and Virgil (*Aen.* 10.395–96, hand), a mutilation/*discrimen* inflicted on the twin pair Larides and Thymber.[116] Lucretius, for

113. Cf. Segal 1998, 36.

114. Cf. Conte 1968, 234–35 and Fantham 1992a *ad BC* 2.181–84.

115. Cf. *vivam Met.* 15.879 in Ovid's sphragis.

116. Eustathius (vol. 3, 818) offers the variant "talking head" for the Iliadic line. For Ennius's possible imitation of *Il.* 10.457 cf. Skutsch 1985 on *Ann.* 483–84; in addition see 485–86 Skutsch (*caput* [head] with *tuba*) = Lactantius on Stat. *Theb.* 11.56, the only known verbal echo from Ennius in Statius. Cf. Harrison 1991 on *Aen.* 10.395–96 for the Ennian-Virgilian-Lucretian background of this passage.

Friedrich 1948, 297–99 and Skutsch 1985, 644–46 point out occurrences of this motif in the novelist-historiographers of Alexander. Skutsch also proposes occurrences in Hellenistic historical epics and touches upon scientific accounts; cf. further King 1998, 222–24 on "wandering wombs." In this chapter I shall confine myself to the epic tradition of this topos. Cf. Fuhrmann 1968, 543: "Einzig beim Epos reichen die überlieferten Specimina für eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche Betrachtung aus."

his part, provides a distinctly "scientific" account of the phenomenon (*DRN* 3.642–56).[117] He uses the epic repertoire to illustrate his atomic view of the universe and draws parallels between the dismemberment of the body and the fragmentation of souls and the universe into atoms. For him, the epic hero is part of this universe, and so his spirit must fall apart into atoms shortly after death. Lucretius's philosophical reading of Homer and Ennius focuses not on the virtue of the hero but on what it actually means to die. By thinking out epic in terms of atoms, not war, Lucretius enriches epic imagery. Homer depicts the heads of people who are cut down while begging for their life. Hence the idea behind the motif seems to have been that humans can die faster than the sound they produce. Homer's scenes are thus striking examples of words being used in vain. By contrast, Lucretius confronts us with severed arms and legs that feature remains of a cut-apart soul, a method that opens up our motif to new poetic approaches. The word *semianimus* gets imbued with new sense. In Lucretius's interpretation it means not only "half-dead" but literally "with half a spirit," for the rest of it may die separately in another body part nearby. Lucretius looks back to Homer and Ennius in order to manipulate and exploit them for his philosophy.[118] Virgil later also imitates the latter two (among others), but his reading is influenced by his reading of Lucretius and he thus brings philosophy into the *Aeneid.*[119] Finally, Ovid looks back to all of them and exploits the versatility of the body through his epic reading of Lucretius.[120] Altogether there are four instances of our motif in the *Metamorphoses*, which I shall discuss in what follows. Two heads, which keep talking (*Met.* 5.104–6, head of Emathion; *Met.* 11.50, head of Orpheus), one hand that keeps twitching (*Met.* 5.115, hand of the bard Lampetides), and finally the tongue of Philomela, which offers one last lisp (*Met.* 6.557).

It has long been recognized that Ovid scatters figures of the poet throughout the *Metamorphoses.*[121] As we will see, all four automatisms in the *Metamorphoses*, and most obviously Orpheus, whose head keeps lamenting after death, provide a metapoetical background. They are not just virtuoso études for

117. Cf. also Segal 1990, 118–43 on Lucretius's technique of enumerating body parts to prove the soul's mortality.

118. On Lucretius's possible debts to Ennius cf. Skutsch 1985, 12 and 646 on *DNR* 3.642–45.

119. Cf. Hardie 1993, 74–76, and 117–18; for Virgil's intertextuality with Ennius note *micant oculi* (eyes twitch, 483 Skutsch / 472 Vahlen) and *micant digiti* (fingers twitch, *Aen.* 10.396). Lucr. *DNR* 3.653 might have provided inspiration for *digiti.* Cf. also Ennius's *caput a cervice revolsum* (head severed from its neck) from the same fragment and Virg. *Georg.* 4.523.

120. Cf. Segal 2001, 84–86.

121. For internal narrators in the *Met.* cf. Barchiesi 2001; for artists (often with metapoetical background) cf. Leach 1974, Lateiner 1984, Harries 1990, Anderson 1989; on the Song of Calliope cf. Hinds 1987, ch. 4; on Orpheus, cf. Segal 1989 and Knox 1986, ch. 4; on the Speech of Pythagoras as Empedoclean epos cf. Hardie 1995; on the Lycian farmers cf. Clauss 1989.

bloodshed's sake. In what follows, I will demonstrate that the depictions of violence in three of these passages are not simply an expression of the author's bad taste or fascination with cruelty; nor do they serve merely to stress the unreality of what happens.[122] Rather, these automatisms meet the demands of fine-spun poetry. They display the metapoetics of the *Metamorphoses* and constitute a literary heritage that Lucan is eager to incorporate into his epic body.

Ovid's Philomela

In *Metamorphoses* 6.424–674, Ovid tells the story of Philomela and Procne. Philomela is the daughter of the king of Athens and sister of Procne, who marries Tereus, the king of Thrace. Tereus agrees to travel to Athens and escort Philomela to Thrace for a visit. On the voyage, however, Tereus lusts for Philomela, and once they arrive in Thrace, he forces her into a cabin in the woods and rapes her. To keep her silent he then cuts out her tongue. Philomela weaves a tapestry that tells her story and sends it to her sister Procne, who in revenge kills her son Itys and feeds him to his father Tereus. When the latter tries to kill the sisters, all three metamorphose into birds.

Philomela's weaving, a substitute for her lost speech, has long been acknowledged as a metaphor for literary production, and the whole episode has been read under the aspect of violated social structures.[123] The topos of weaving can be found in the stories of Arachne (*Met.* 6.1–145) in the same book and that of the daughters of Minyas (*Met.* 4.1–415) and thus connects the Philomela episode to other episodes of storytelling. A fundamental point in the Philomela episode is that by removing the tongue Tereus removes the very organ through which humans differentiate themselves from beasts. In order to keep her humanity Philomela thus has to invent her own language in her tapestry, an action that shows clear parallels to the Io episode (*Met.* 1.583–750). To demonstrate the significance of the Philomela passage, I shall explore how violence functions here to underscore recurrent motifs and helps to weave this story into the text of the *Metamorphoses.*

A close reading will carve out the details that make Philomela's tongue so important. To begin with, if one translates the epic language of bodily penetration, violation, and integrity in this passage into the language of Freudian

122. Cf. Williams 1978, 189–92 and 254–56 and Fuhrmann 1968, 37.

123. Cf. Segal 1994 on metapoetical implications ("central role of language," 267): weaving, reading, silence, persuasion, deceit, and the crossing of boundaries, esp. 264–69 on Philomela as figure of the poet; Pavlock 1991 touches on wedding, family roles, social structures; cf. also Otis 1970, 209–16 and Joplin 1991.

symbolism, one will find that Ovid features a detailed oral rape in the subtext. Firstly Tereus is described as *stimulatus* (aroused, *Met.* 6.550). Is this caused by his anger and fear or by the words of Philomela and his reawakening lust? Then he takes out his sword, a phallic symbol, which is already poised (again) for action (551).[124] He grabs Philomela's hair and the scene goes on with bondage (*vincla* 553).[125] Philomela, however, bravely offers him her throat (*iugulum* 553).[126] In this passage the syntax supports a reading of the tongue grammatically and literally as *pars pro toto* for the girl (*ille indignantem . . . vocantem . . . luctantem . . . conprensam . . . linguam* "he seized the protesting . . . calling and struggling tongue," 555–56).[127] What we witness next contains at least traces of fellatio: Tereus uses his "weapon," that is, phallus, to mutilate Philomela's mouth. The twitching of her tongue might thus even be interpreted in sexual terms. By focusing on the tongue Ovid radically alters the audience's perspective. He dwells on the mutilation, turns the inside out, and makes the reader linger on the violence. The sexual rape of Philomela—not explicitly described before—thus serves as subtext to her mutilation.

The tongue obtains here a threefold identity that justifies its prominent position in this passage. First, it is a body part in the literal sense. Second, *pars pro toto* it represents Philomela.[128] As Philomela's name marks her as sound and song loving, she also suffers a loss of identity with the loss of her speech. Third, the tongue embodies a reification of language.[129] Through the tongue abstract language achieves an actual presence in the story. Philomela loses her speech, her ability to speak: *lingua* is dying literally in front of our eyes on the bloody floor. Unsuccessfully the tongue is trying to creep back to the bodily unit it belongs to up to the very last moment eager to fulfill Philomela's intention to speak. This and Ovid's comparison of the tongue to a snake recall Lucretius's "scientific" approach to dismemberment.[130] Nevertheless, just as a snake's tail can grow again, so Philomela, too, finds a new way to communicate.

Finally, the slow death of the tongue demonstrates how difficult it is to ex-

124. Cf. Adams 1982b, 20–21 and 219 on the use of *gladius* (sword) and numerous examples of sexual metaphors from weaponry. *Accinctus* reads as mediopassive "to get ready for action"; for this use in Ovid cf. *Met.* 7.47.

125. For erotics of hair cf. Apul. *Met.* 2.8; hair is a seat of life and power: who grabs enemies by the hair gains power over them; shorn hair is a sign of slavery; cf Hurschmann 1998, Kötting 1986, and La Follette 1994.

126. "Throat-cutting equalled a defloration" (Loraux 1987, 41).

127. Cf. Richlin 1992, 163.

128. Cf. Richlin 1992, 163 and above *Met.* 5.555–56; cf. also *ipsa iacet* (she lies, 558) and *tremens* (trembling, 560) not unlike a victim of violence.

129. Cf. Kaufhold 1997 for this term and Mazzio 1997, 54.

130. Larmour 1990 suspects debts of Philomela's distress (522) to Iphigeneia's death (Lucr. *DRN* 1.92–96).

tinguish language and rumors. In the *Metamorphoses* this is contextualized in the powerful depiction of the House of *Fama* (*Met.* 12.39–63) and the claim to *Nachleben* in the epilogue (*vivam* "I shall live," *Met.* 15.879). We cannot help but remember that the body of the Virgilian *Fama* consists of a multitude of tongues. Philomela's tongue then figures as a synecdoche for *Fama*, which in the Philomela episode illustrates in detail how words are used in vain but simultaneously also bears the connotation of their power. The automatism of the cut-off tongue, we may conclude, courts readers' attention and alerts them to the many possible interpretations of this passage.

Talking Heads

Two of Ovid's automatisms occur at Perseus's and Andromeda's wedding feast *(Met.* 5.1–249), when a battle breaks out between former rivals for the princess's hand, and involve displaced and defenseless persons: a bard and an old man. The whole scene has been interpreted as "a true parody of epic," and here our motif helps to set the stage.[131]

The old man Emathion is described as *aequi cultor timidusque deorum* (he loves justice and reveres the gods, *Met.* 5.100). Even though he clings to an altar, a sacred asylum, he is cut down. His death thus serves to construct his murderer as a Mezentius-like *contemptor divum* (despiser of the gods). The only weapon the old man has are words (*loquendo pugnat* "he fights talking," *Met* 5.101), which he employs in curses for attack (*incesso* = attack with words). Ever the more his death reminds us of that of Priam (cf. *Met.*5.103 and *Aen.* 2.534), who curses Neoptolemus before he is killed at an altar. When Emathion's head is struck off he serves as a further example for words that are used in vain. In an epic as obsessed with the figure of the poet as the *Metamorphoses*, a severed talking head that keeps fighting with words provides perhaps the most appropriate parody of epic bloodbath and of scenes such as Virgil's cut-off hand grasping for its sword (*Aen.* 10.395–96). The transfer of a poet figure to epic fighting, where he fights according to his abilities, depicts the word at war: the poet's weapons are words, with which the would-be epic warrior tries to fight when he finds himself in a generic distorting mirror that produces a self-reflexive travesty. A further poet figure is the bard Lampetides, who had been invited to sing the festal song (*Met.* 5.111–18). He is a man used to *pacis opus* (a peaceful task) and his instrument is *inbelle* (unwarlike). Hence Lampetides provides an image of a peaceful (pastoral) poet misplaced in the epic warfare he usually only sings

131. Cf. Otis 1970, 346.

about (if at all).[132] In contrast to Emathion he does not take part in the fighting in any way. Bömer claims that this scene has a lyrical atmosphere and lacks the tasteless exaggeration of parody.[133] He points, however, to the unusual conjunction of Greek poetic and traditional Roman material in Greek *Styx* and Roman *Manes.* To me this passage seems nevertheless to exhibit traces of Ovidian humor, for despite the different vowel quantities a pun in *Stygiis cane cetera Manibus* (*Met.* 5.115–16) seems to have been overlooked: "sing the rest of your song to the Stygian shades / with Stygian (dead) hands" (cf. *digitis morientibus* 117).[134] Unlike Ovid, who repeatedly switches in the *Metamorphoses* from epic to elegy, the bard Lampetides does not manage his generic transition—from *hymenaios* song to epic.[135] This poetic failure finds its expression in his *miserabile carmen*, his own lament but also his last elegy (played in or with dying dactyls/fingers). In death he reverts back to his own non-epic genre. Within this generic parody the automatism of his fingers (even though they are not actually cut off) serves to provide space for humor, but it also draws attention to the implications of the genres Ovid parodies.

In conclusion, we have seen that Ovid's applications of the automatism of the cut-off body part clearly are not mere cruel decoration but serve to point to metapoetic discourse on the power of the word and the poet. Ovid's body imagery has thus smoothed the way for Lucan's use of the body as key metaphor in the *Bellum Civile.*

Lucan

Lucan confronts his readers in the *Bellum Civile* with war on every possible level. Not only does the epic plot constantly involve its actors in fighting and mutilation but even the sentence structure and the epic's use of rhetorical figures mirror the state of civil war; the word itself is "at war."[136] Lucan shows us a world in chaos, without gods or, to use a Stoic analogy, a headless world. Here the rhetorical trope of hypallage—that is the reversal of the syntactic relation of two words (as in "her beauty's face")—combined with a "mass of personified weapons" is extensively used in the language of wounding and cements the

132. On genre-specific poet figures cf. Masters 1992, 6.

133. Bömer 1969–86 *ad loc.*

134. I am well aware that *Manes* and *manus* scan differently and that *manibus* (hands) would metrically not be possible in this position.

135. Ovid had experienced similar problems in *Am.* 1.1; note also the ambiguous meter of the first two lines of the *Met.*; cf. Wheeler 1999, ch. 1.

136. Cf. Henderson 1998a.

impression that neither rationality nor reason controls the soldiers' bodies in battle.[137] In addition these two stylistic features project the idea that the literal body is practicing syntactical self-mutilation. Examples such as *percussum est pectore ferrum* (the weapon is struck by the breast, *BC* 4.561) and *sed hinc iugulis, hinc ferro bella geruntur* (but on one side war was waged with throats, with weapons on the other, *BC* 7.533) make clear that the "inversion of subject-object relations" constructs suicidal body parts that enact their own death by a form of proto-automatism.[138] The usual sequence of the automatisms is shadowed: not swift blow followed by an autarchic limb, but instead autarchic breasts joining battle. Is this just another example of the chaos of civil war, an upside-down world where flesh becomes weapon? Or do we rather witness Lucan's deconstruction of military heroism by staging a fight with suicidal limbs? Clearly these automatisms do not add anything to the victim's *kleos.* Critics have mourned the lack of a main hero figure in Lucan's epic.[139] For the *Metamorphoses,* which also lack a main hero, scholars have crowned the poet as its true hero.[140] If this is true for the *Bellum Civile* as well, the rhetorical figure of hypallage then helps to build up Lucan's fame as poet-hero, who successfully fights his syntactic combat. He stages a "crash of syntax with concept" for his "poetics of totalizing, civil, war."[141] In what follows I shall examine some passages that showcase how Lucan develops and employs autarchic body imagery and exemplify once more his conceptualization of the body.

Medusa and Marius Gratidianus

Fantham points out the shifting of active and passive in Lucan's Medusa narrative (*BC* 9.619–99), and the fate of Medusa's head exemplifies this.[142] Medusa's living snake-hair proves to be her undoing in the end (*BC* 9.682–83). Snakes risen from her blood, however, will remain as an everlasting reminder and plague, a perpetuated automatism of Medusa's delightful flowing hair.[143] In

137. Hübner 1972, 577 remarks that hypallage often represents dead and motionless objects in living and independent motion. *Corpus* (body) is used for a book roll in Ov. *Tr.* 2, 535; Most 1992, 407 links the human body to the written corpus and to literary stylistics. Cf. also Henderson 1998a, 194.

138. Bartsch 1997, 23.

139. Johnson 1987, 1.

140. Solodow 1988, 73.

141. Henderson 1998a, 195.

142. Fantham 1992b, 100 and 104 on *BC* 9.652.

143. Note the "semi-automatism" of *BC* 9.672 *vigilat pars magna comarum* (a large part of her hair keeps watch).

what follows, Lucan's snake passage then provides a remarkable detailed *aristeia* leading to six dead soldiers and one amputation caused by these snakes. The reader will remember other locks that guarantee the glory of their former possessors.[144] It is as if the latent (epic) encounter of Berenice's lock (*Cat*. 66.42) has been blown up to full epic scale. But as before with Ovid's bard Lampetides, generic transitions are not without fault in Lucan as well; instead of a heavenly constellation of stars we find earthly reptiles, which nevertheless function to glorify. For sure Perseus can hardly serve as hero of this passage, as he is described as *trepidus* and *tremens* (anxious and trembling, *BC* 9.675). Rather the episode serves to manifest the fame of the antiheroine Medusa.[145] Her *comae* (locks) become the *comites* (companions) of Cato and his soldiers and thus transfer her (and her fame) to the narrative present of the *Bellum Civile*. She thus unexpectedly becomes the Romans' antagonist. Lucan's Hellenistic etiology provides a distorted image of autarchic encomiastic hair as known in literature from Callimachus and Catullus.[146]

Similar to the Medusa episode the *acroteriasmos*, the mutilation of hands, ears, and nose, of Marius Gratidianus (*BC* 2.173–94) reworks the literary tradition. Conte points to Ovid's tongue of Philomela as a model, as we have seen above a sequence loaded with metapoetics.[147] We find that acts of silencing and dehumanization shape this episode, but Marius's twitching tongue does far more than simply stress the cruelty of his torturers. As he was a well-known *orator*—mentioned as such in Cicero's *Brutus* 223—it is no wonder that tongue and hands play such an important role in this passage, as they constitute the main tools for his gesture and speech.[148] Marius's function as a sacrifice puts his dismemberment in animalic and dehumanizing context; he becomes assimilated to the sacrificial butchery performed in religious acts. In addition Lucan emphasizes that his face is made unrecognizable (*BC* 2.190–91): no death mask, proudly carried in the funeral procession, will keep his memory alive.[149] Marius's distorted corpse also looks back to Priam's headless trunk in *Aeneid* 2, lying on the shore; but at the same time it foreshadows Pompey's end in Egypt.[150] Moreover Marius Gratidianus is in fact a relative of Cicero by adoption, and we may speculate whether his silencing even foreshadows Cicero's

144. Call. fr. 110 (Pfeiffer) and Catul. 66 *"Coma Berenices."*

145. Cf. Fantham 1992b, 104 on Medusa's posthumous victories and 106 on parallels between Argos and Medusa.

146. For Lucan's sources cf. Fantham 1992b, 111–13.

147. Cf. Conte 1968 and Lebek 1976, 297–302.

148. Cf. Quint. *Inst. Or*. 11.3.65–136; Cic. *Orat*. 59 and Graf 1991. Butler 2002 traces the hand of Cicero.

149. Throughout the epic the importance of a proper funeral is stressed; cf. BC 2.157–60.

150. Cf. Fantham 1992a *ad* 189.

decapitation.[151] His fate frames Cicero' fate with the construction of a "family tradition" of (self)sacrifice. Furthermore Lucan links Marius through the phrase *cecidere manus* (down fell the hands, *BC* 2.181) with the artist Daedalus (*Aen.* 6.33). Lucan, however, sets the event—rather cynically—in a more violent context. In the *Aeneid* Daedalus, reminded of the death of his son Icarus and overwhelmed by grief, drops his hands and is thus lead to artistic failure.[152] In contrast, Marius's hands actually drop off during his own demise; his total dismemberment stands in for the dissection of the Roman body in the future civil war and thus prefigures the downfall of the Roman Republic.

The Sea Battle at Massilia and Pompey's Head

The sea battle at Massilia offers a feast of bloodshed. Remarkable in particular seems the mutilation of an unnamed twin brother that features the automatism of his cut-off hand (*BC* 3.603–26). Critics note the influence of three traditions in this passage: the twin brother motif is linked with epic mutilation and the *vir fortis sine manibus* (strong man without hands) topos that was practised in speeches at the declamation schools.[153]

In contrast to Virgil's twin pair Larides and Thymber (*Aen.* 10.395–96), which stood model for this passage, Lucan lets one of the twin brothers survive to serve as a living reminder of his dead brother (*BC* 3.608). In Virgil's account and a similar passage in Ovid (*Met.* 5.140) the differing wounds help to distinguish the brothers; in Lucan, however, one brother remains unscathed and takes over the other's identity. The child-parent relationship also shifts from *gratus* (dear) in Virgil to *gloria* (pride) in Lucan.[154] And the story of a wounded and soon mutilated soldier who bravely keeps on fighting is usually told of a Caesarian civil war combatant.[155] Lucan, however, chooses a Massilian hero, a city with well-known Greek roots.[156] He thus "deromanizes" his hero, makes him an approximation of *libertas* (freedom) and holds up the pattern that hero-

151. Cicero had prevented Catiline from becoming head of state; Sall. *Hist*. 1.44 (cf. *scholia Bernensia ad loc.*) mentions Catiline's involvement in Marius's murder. Some might even want to argue that Cicero's death and decapitation was to feature in the unfinished part of the *Bellum Civile*; For an overview of theories about the structure of the epic cf. Schmitt 1989, 193–214 and Backhaus 2005, 44–54.

152. Cf. Putnam 1998, 90.

153. Cf. Hunink 1992 *ad* 609.

154. Metger 1970, 426.

155. Metger 1970, 427–28; Luck 1985 *ad loc.*; Hunink 1992, 609 lists further sources.

156. Massilia was founded ca. 600 BC as colony of Phokaia; for the foundation myth cf. Arist. fr. 549 Rose = Athen. 13.576a; Iust. 43.3.4.–13 whose source, Pompeius Trogus, could have been known to Lucan.

ism is not possible in a civil war between Romans.[157] While in the prose versions of the sea battle the actual cutting off of the hand is only a briefly mentioned precondition for a soldier's further one-armed *aristeia,* Lucan closes in on it.[158] Metger interprets the hand's automatism as "eine Art Selbstbehauptungswille, der bis zur Sinnlosigkeit gesteigert ist."[159] Even in death the hand keeps its grip and its place while the hero bravely battles on to lose his other arm as well.[160]

I have pointed above to the link between the integrity of the individual body and the integrity of the communal body, where "the soldier's body is made to stand for the military corps itself."[161] There I have cited the dismemberment of the Massilian twin as an example for a military battle in miniature, where our hero's body becomes the shield of his brother and comrades. Ironically the one who lacks arms becomes *arma tegens* (protecting arms, *BC* 3.620), and finally turns his dying body into a weapon. The automatism of his hand is a rebellion (*tamen* "still," *BC* 3.612) against a death inflicted by an anonymous opponent. *Pars pro toto* it mirrors the victim's own reaction to his injury (*BC* 3.614–15).[162] This passage thus offers an exploration of the double meanings of limbs, weapons, and forces. The single twin's body becomes an image of a battle within a battle, a *mise en abyme* in a cosmos of violence.[163] In addition, dismemberment and the dismembered *aristeia* of our hero exhibit the construction of his fame. With this Massilian man Lucan aims to provide a contrast to the Romans who are tainted by civil war.

The last and most crucial automatism I will discuss is found in a key scene of the *Bellum Civile*: Pompey is murdered and then decapitated while still breathing (*dum vivunt, BC* 8.682), an act that is equated with the loss of the head of the world (*caput mundi*). Pompey still lives "to see" his humiliation by Achillas. That Pompey is killed by a Roman soldier, even though now in the service of the Egyptians, makes his death a civil war in miniature, a Roman killed by a Roman.[164] Combined with Lucan's delight in detail and (hyper) realism, this creates the horror of this scene.[165] To the Roman reader who was protected from corporal punishment by the *lex Porcia* decapitation must have

157. Hunink 1992 *ad* 610 points to the juxtaposition of *Romanae* with *Graia.*

158. Metger 1970, 427 looks at Val. Max. 3.2.22; Suet. *Div. Jul.* 68 and Plu. *Caes.* 16 but misses out on the model of Hrdt. 6.114: Aischylus's brother Cynegeirus, which already brings together the notion of honor with a smitten-off hand, which Esposito 1987, 99 calls "archetipo."

159. Metger 1970, 429.

160. Hunink 1992 *ad* 613.

161. Bartsch 1997, 11 (cf. also n. 58).

162. Metger 1970, 432.

163. Cf. the Military Corps. pp. 22–23.

164. Bartsch 1997, 24 n. 36.

165. Schnepf 1970, 384 on the use of realism to create horror.

been a particularly grueling offense.[166] Two further decapitations—of Crassus and Cicero—provide a frame for the civil war marking the downfall of the Republic. This condition, heedlessness, then becomes emblematic for the end of the Republic.[167]

In this passage Pompey quits the epos as a hero when dying in a dignified almost Stoic fashion while displaying concern for his reputation.[168] Pompey loses his corporeal integrity, but tries to preserve his inner wholeness and thus becomes great when he falls.[169] Automatisms of cut-off body parts transgress temporality as limbs live on even though the body dies. Lucan augments this temporal distance into eternity in Pompey's case. He traverses the finality of death when he depicts Pompey's soul laughing at its headless trunk (*BC* 9.14). He does indeed live on and is for certain in no danger to be forgotten. As Magnus lacks burial, Lucan can make *Hic situs est Magnus* (Here lies Magnus, *BC* 8.793) a slogan that fits the entire world (*BC* 8.798–99): Pompey (and Lucan) will be remembered.[170]

Afterlife

In my brief survey of the most memorable epic mutilations, the automatisms of severed limbs, we have followed the career of an epic motif from its humble origins in single lines to steady expansion and increased prominence. In Lucan's epic it then takes center stage. We have also witnessed how it aquires a role as vehicle of metapoetics. In addition this motif focuses less on the fame of the mutilator than that of the mutilated, be it the Gorgon, an orator, an anonymous warrior, or even Pompey. In the latter case in particular the depiction of the open body functions as a climactic way to sum up and promote his fame, transgressing time and space boundaries. He is representative of the epic's and Lucan's claim to fame, an expression of "*vivam*" (I shall live). Equally, our motif finds a poetic afterlife in image repertoires that reach far beyond classical epic.[171]

---

166. Rotondi 1962, 268; Mommsen 1887, 916. Selinger 2001, 352 points to the apostle Paul (Acts 16.22–38).

167. On Crassus cf. *BC* 1.99–100 and 1.107–8 and Plu. *Crass.* 31–33. On Cicero cf. *Liv*. quoted by Sen. *Suas.* 7.14; Plu. Cic. 48–49 and Richlin 1999.

168. See pp. 59–60.

169. Pompey's death thus shows parallels to the "beautiful deaths" of tragic figures such as Iphigenia and Polyxena. Cf. Loraux 1987, 47 and Vernant 1991, 60.

170. Henderson 1998a, 202.

171. Cf. Zwierlein 1970, Irving 1983, Gogol, *The Nose*, and the "handy" butler in *The Addams Family* films as well as a handy cameo in *Pirates of the Carribean I.*

CHAPTER 2

Embodiments

Lucan and *Fama*

> Anthropologically cultural memory stems from the remembrance of the dead. This means the obligation of relatives to remember the names of their dead and to hand them down to posterity eventually. Remembrance of the dead has a religious and a profane aspect, which manifest as "pietas" and "fama" respectively. Piety means the duty of the descendants to keep honoring the memory of the dead. By definition piety has to be performed by others, can only be provided by the living for the dead. *Fama*, however, in the sense of lasting glory, can to a certain degree be taken care of in one's lifetime. *Fama* is a secular form of self-memorialization, which has much to do with staging one's self. Christianity has largely overshadowed the ancient concern for lasting glory among posterity with its concern for the salvation of the soul at Judgment Day.[1]

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Lucan's epic body is tied together by a wealth of body imagery. In addition Lucan's writing also reveals his care for himself and his epic body in line with the "ancient concern for lasting glory." This chapter will further explore which role in Lucan's epic technique is played by *Fama*, whose cultural history is analyzed in this chapter's epigraph. This is, however, merely one side of the multifaceted *Fama*, whose name in modern English translates not only as fame, glory and renown but also as rumor, report,

1. Assmann 2009, 33 (my translation).

tradition, and narration.[2] Lucan works hard to make himself part of *Fama* so as to cement his lasting glory, and so do the protagonists of his epic. In addition, however, he also employs *Fama*'s other side by introducing narratives with the formula *(ut) fama est* "as the traditional story goes" or—showing a more active *Fama—fama ferebat* "rumor has it." In this way she plays an important part in Lucan's epic technique and becomes a directing force in his epic.

There has been much scholarly lament over Lucan's fragmentary and fragmented story-line, a feature that has certainly contributed to the perception of the *Bellum Civile* as a wild, untamed opus. However, Lucan must have been aware that he would need to maintain the momentum of his epic—to give it impetus but also, most important, to keep the reader under his spell. Marti has pointed out that the poet gains credibility thanks to his historical subject matter, but "he loses in the absence of suspense; . . . in order to arouse a strong desire and expectation that some unforeseen development may occur, the poet must find other devices."[3] Lucan had to bring together the many episodes, the many voices of his epic, into a wider frame. He needed to find a unifying concept that would allow him to incorporate so many sources of information and so many perspectives without letting his work fall apart. In what follows I shall suggest that one of the threads that pull the reader through the epic and simultaneously account for suspense and the unexpected is the application of Rumor/*Fama* in many different forms and on many different levels. This creates a conscious discourse on the reliability of sources, on knowledge and on what we thought we knew for sure.

Masters has pointed out the dichotomy between *fas* and *nefas* in the *Bellum Civile* and shown how Lucan again and again measures against each other the urge to tell and the horror of the unspeakable.[4] The topos of speaking while not telling anything, or telling much without having a voice, seems central to the first book of the epic. As this book has to establish two of the epic's main characters and foreshadows much of the story yet to come, it is obliged to give away information. Those who speak about *nefas* (sacrilege), however, contaminate themselves; accordingly many who in fact have knowledge prefer to remain silent (Arruns at *BC* 1.637–38). Moreover, while some voices tell us things seemingly irrelevant (the catalog of foreign peoples at *BC* 1.396–465), others are too scared to speak. Dead silence thus frames the speech of the men of Ariminum (BC 1.244–61).[5] By exploring the dichotomy between telling silence

2. Cf. Hardie 2009, 555.

3. Marti 1975, 77.

4. Masters 1992, 9. Romans derived *fas* and *nefas* from *fari* (to speak); *dies fasti* are "days on which it is allowed to speak" (*dies quibus fari licet*, Varro *Ling.* 6.29); cf. Feeney 1992.

5. Cf. *BC* 1.247 and 1.257–59. The following simile in *BC* 1.259–61 features the silence of land and

and silenced telling, I will demonstrate that Rumor plays an important part in Lucan's epic technique and allows him to build up a crescendo of things unspeakable (*nefanda*).

Already at the very beginning of the poem Lucan connects his programmatic opening phrase "of wars we sing" (*bella . . . canimus, BC* 1.1–2) with "universal guilt" (*in commune nefas,* 1.6). This makes clear that the reader should not expect to find any constitutive or constructive elements here, unlike in parts of Virgil's *Aeneid.* Lucan goes on to stage the *nefas* (sacrilege) of civil war as a topos hard to describe in rational terms; together with the many paradoxes he employs this creates a nimbus of irrationality. Frequent authorial questions that remain unanswered endorse the impression that we cannot know everything, cannot face every aspect of Roman civil war. Confirmation of this is also found in Lucan's sudden retreat into silence at *BC* 7.552–56, culminating in *tacebo* (I shall not tell, *BC* 7.556) and his transposition of excessively violent scenes onto earlier conflicts under Sulla and Marius (*BC* 2) or the "outlandish" sea battle against Greek-founded Massilia (*BC* 3).[6] By conducting civil war, however, the Romans have forfeited knowledge, not power, as they miss out on the chance to discover the source of the Nile.[7] This exploit is of such importance to Caesar that he even contemplates abandoning civil war for it.[8]

The prologue also shows us what "crimes and guilt" (*scelera ista nefasque, BC* 1.37) were for. All this was done for you, Nero (*BC* 1.45). In this respect civil war brought Rome its emperors and smoothed the way for Nero, who will preside as muse over the poet's work and serve as substitute for the gods Apollo and Bacchus (*BC* 1.64–65). Nonetheless Nero does not open up hidden secrets or provide access to knowledge closed off to us, as Apollo would do. Instead he provides creative power only (*vires, BC* 1.66).

Thus by the time we arrive at the introduction of the two main protagonists of civil war, Caesar and Pompey, the concept of *scire nefas* (*BC* 1.127), of "forbidden knowledge," has already been spelled out.

At this point *Fama*, translatable as both Fame and Rumor, makes her debut (*BC* 1.131). Lucan employs her to measure up the two contestants against each other. Pompey is introduced as a fame-addict who lives a quasi-theatrical life of idle staginess but holds a mighty name.[9] In contrast Caesar is characterized

---

sea. On Lucan's use of "communal speech" ("die Reden der Massen") cf. Schmitt 1995.

6. There is, in addition, also a tradition of *nefas* (sacrilege) in the fraternal strife that bloodies the foundation myth of Rome (*BC* 1.92–97).

7. Cf. *sub iuga . . . gens si qua iacet nascenti conscia Nilo* (Beneath your yoke could have come the race, if it exists, that knows Nile's birth, *BC* 1.19–20).

8. Cf. *spes sit mihi certa videndi / Niliacos fontes, bellum civile relinquam* (Let me have a hope assured of seeing the springs of Nile, and I will abandon civil war, *BC* 10.191–92).

9. Cf. ***famae****que petitor* (a seeker of fame, *BC* 1.131), *plausuque sui gaudere theatri* (rejoicing in

by not only having a reputation but also the primal energy to match it.[10] Immediately afterward *Fama* begins her work. By giving a voice to latent feelings and dragging to light some of the underlying causes for war, she starts to spin her web of "further voices" in the *Bellum Civile* (*BC* 1.159).[11]

Fama often functions in *analepsis* as record keeper of past fame who spreads stories of earlier times. But she can also be employed proleptically in the shape of a report or rumor: "Report can run ahead of an event: in the historians *fama* of an approaching army may arrive before the army itself."[12] Frequently *Fama* also functions as a powerful "Grossmacher" (enlarger) expanding and broadening what she has to tell.[13] We see this exemplified in the *Bellum Civile* when false *fama*, empty rumor, proves to be Caesar's mightiest weapon, when augmenting genuine fears (*BC* 1.469). Here *Fama* reveals one of her characteristic features: "she unlocks countless tongues to utter false assertions" (*BC* 1.472), which leads to a quick increase in the scope of the rumors spread (*BC* 1.485). These rumors finally leave Rome in a state of panic and cause a mass exodus of her inhabitants (*BC* 1.486–93). Caesar's fame has multiplied, becomes stronger and stronger, and now haunts the *caput mundi* (head of the world), troubling both Rome and Pompey (*BC* 2.573–74). Even Pompey's self-appraisal (*BC* 2.582–92) in which he deploys his own fame does not manage to overcome the vague rumors about Caesar's military advance. It seems that the more indistinct a rumor the more powerful it becomes, as an already anxious mind empowers it with the worst things imaginable.

In the end triumph is granted to Caesar's *Fama* when Pompey decides to withdraw his army: "a force already overcome by rumor about Caesar as yet unseen" (*iam victum* ***fama*** *non visi Caesaris agmen*, *BC* 2.600). Nevertheless, Pompey as well manages to take advantage of his own fame and links it with that of Rome.

> *Euphraten Nilumque move, quo nominis usque*
> *nostri* ***fama*** *venit, quas est volgata per urbes*
> *post me Roma ducem.*

---

applause in the theater he had built, 1.133); *stat* ***magni nominis*** *umbra* (he stands, the shadow of a great name, 1.135). On Pompey's theatricality cf. Leigh 1997, 114.

10. Cf. *sed non in Caesare tantum / nomen erat nec* ***fama*** *ducis sed nescia virtus / stare loco* (Caesar had not only a general's name and reputation, but never resting energy, *BC* 1.143–44). Nevertheless with growing renown he acquires the same weakness for fame. At Troy he is a *mirator famae* (*BC* 9.961).

11. Cf. Lyne 1987 for the slogan. I will follow up some hidden voices in detail in an analysis of *BC* 1 below.

12. Hardie 2009, 557.

13. Cf. Hardie 2002b and Hardie 1999, 98.

[Stir up Euphrates and Nile, as far as my name's **fame** has reached, through cities in which Rome became **renowned** through my command.] (*BC* 2.633–35)

We will observe this technique of tapping into larger fame, of linking a person's repute with wider issues, in Lucan himself when he steps forward at two occasions to secure his poetic afterlife. Lucan explicitly knots together Caesar's fame with his own and styles himself as a new Homer who has found his Achilles in Caesar (*BC* 9.982–85). Together Lucan and Caesar double their chances: the *Bellum Civile* will be read in future times because of its famous subject and/or because of the famous author. In a previous instance Lucan displays an equally high level of self-consciousness. In *BC* 7 Lucan demonstrates his awareness that he is writing history and builds up interdependence between his subject matter and his writings. Accordingly each will help the other's lasting fame.

haec et apud seras gentes populosque nepotum
sive sua tantum venient in saecula ***fama***
sive aliquid magnis nostri quoque cura laboris
nominibus prodesse potest . . .

[Even among later races and the people of posterity, these events—whether they come down to future ages by their own fame alone or whether my devotion also and my toil can do anything for mighty names . . .] (*BC* 7.207–10)

In *BC* 7, a book whose content in many respects would be expected to constitute the climax of the *Bellum Civile*, this is the only instance of the word *fama*. On the one hand this is the morphological consequence of treating a subject that does not allow those involved in actual fighting to win any glory. Civil war must only gain fame through its historical importance and its narrator's art (and vice versa, so Lucan hopes). On the other hand it is in the end the poet Lucan himself who controls the flux of fame in his epic. He can distribute it in theory—and in practice as the examples of characters such as Scaeva and Vulteius show—*ad libitum.*[14] Lucan has recognized that *Fama* can work both inside his epic for his characters and outside his epic for the narrator. He secures the lion's share by placing himself in the epic's center, by writing himself into his epic and by linking his fate to its fate. He makes himself part of his liter-

14. Cf. Marti 1966, 239 on Scaeva: "Lucan magnifies a well-attested historical incident into heroic poetry." Marti also provides an analysis of the rhetoric applied (253–54). Cf. Leigh 1997, 158–90 on Scaeva's elaboration as rhetorical exemplum and 193–94 for the historical sources on Vulteius.

ary corpus and will—so he hopes—keep alive his name. The *Bellum Civile* will propagate if not guarantee his fame long after his death. As a result Lucan writes his own monument with verve and passion. With polished *sententiae* and rhetorical splendor he shines his literary tombstone. Rhetoric reaches new dimensions if you compose for your own afterlife. Consequently, the case that this epic pleads comes across as that of Lucan himself. As the *Bellum Civile* remains Lucan's last and probably unfinished opus, his personal voice in the narrative bestows an epitaphic gesture on the entire epic that serves as his monument.[15]

To sum up, even the few examples discussed so far have established the importance of *Fama* in Lucan's epic. We shall find the main protagonists (and the author) in everlasting attempts to outdo one another's fame. Lucan's discourse on *Fama*, however, also provides insights into further aspects of the workings of fame. Having confronted us with Pompey's static and Caesar's fast-growing reputation, both already in existence but so very different, Lucan also shows us *Fama*'s beginnings. As with *Aeneid* 4, *BC* 4 in particular has rich offerings for the reader on the lookout for *Fama*. Here Vulteius persuades his men to enact collective suicide. Their death is virtuous and largely motivated by their hope of gaining fame (*quo plus habeat mors unica* ***famae*** "so that our unique death would grow with fame," *BC* 4.509)—even though it constitutes a *mise en abyme*, a self-reflexive embedding of a small version of civil war into the larger civil war context.[16] We are allowed to witness the self-construction of a reputation, a deathly do-it-yourself, that leads to the dawn of fame. Soon ever-increasing *Fama* runs through the world to spread acclaim and glory, for once praising those truly virtuous *nullam maiore locuta est / ore ratem totum discurrens* ***Fama*** *per orbem* (Fame running through all the world spoke of no raft with a louder voice, *BC* 4.573–74).[17]

Fama as "tradition" is frequently linked to "places of memory."[18] Lucan confronts us with two such places that bear their very own connotations and are inhabited by and overloaded with their own rumors and reputations: Troy and Libya. Both appear in *BC* 9, the book with the highest density of the word *fama*. In addition Lucan also allows us a short glimpse of Athens's fame: now itself a shadow of a great name like Pompey, it constitutes a miniature on the rise and

15. The habit of self-memorialization runs in Lucan's family. Ker 2009 has explored the modes of (self-)representation and the literary traces of the death of Seneca.

16. Dällenbach 1989, 8 offers the definition that "a '*mise en abyme*' is any aspect enclosed within a work that shows similarity with the work that contains it."

17. Eldred 2002, 76 takes a distinctly negative stance on Vulteius's fame, which I do not share. In the case of Scaeva, however, Lucan explicitly distances himself. Contrast *infelix, quanta dominum virtute parasti* (Unhappy man! with such enormous valor you bought a master! *BC* 6.262) with *BC* 4.575–77.

18. Cf. Assmann 2009, 298–342.

fall of fame and fortune (*BC* 5.52).[19] A further place that has acquired its own reputation is the Massilian grove.[20] Caesar has it cut down when the Massilians remain entirely unimpressed by his fame.[21] He thereby subsumes local *Fama* to ensure his own preeminence, for in Caesar's world, in a world that is his, there is to be no fame but Caesar's. In addition, the Massilian trees have also been interpreted as a literary forest, standing in for the literary tradition—a tradition that Lucan demonstratively has chopped down to build his own reputation as epic poet.[22] What is more, the Massilians are about to win fame of their own through their heroic sea battle. Pompey and the senate will later acknowledge the Massilians' deeds and have them remembered by honoring their metropolis Phocis with freedom (*BC* 5.53).

However, returning to *BC* 4 we encounter a further instance of *Fama* in Lucan's excursus on the giant Antaeus—whose genealogy according to Hardie defines him as a localized version of *Fama. Fama* and Antaeus are both late births of Mother Earth. Thus with respect to *fuit terrarum gloria* (his mother's pride, *BC* 4.595) Hardie coins the designation *Fama Telluris* (Fame of the Earth) for him. Antaeus's firm-rootedness, however, puts him in contrast with the unlocatable Ovidian *Fama,* whom Lucan employs as a narratological device to direct his narrative. She calls Hercules to Libya "to confront a double of the Virgilian *Fama*," *fama mali* (rumor of evil).[23]

> *tandem volgata cruenti*
> ***fama** mali [. . .]*
> *magnanimum Alciden Libycas excivit in oras.*
>
> [At last the rumor of the blood-stained evil spread and summoned to the shores of Libya great-hearted Hercules.] (*BC* 4.608–10).

In this way Lucan brings together two mighty foes to fight it out. We witness how Hercules, who sides with Pompey as his divine patron and inspires his motto at Pharsalus, fights Antaeus, an aggressive, fast, and forever regrowing version of *Fama.* When interpreting this fight of two *Magni* (heavyweights) as a mirror passage of the battle at Pharsalus, we should also notice the parallels

19. Cf. Feeney 1986a, 240. Athens, already a shadow of former glory, also occurs in the catalog of Pompey's forces (*BC* 3.181–83). In addition Athens is spurned by Alexander the Great as a realm too small (*BC* 10.29). Even faded fame permeates the epic.

20. Cf. *iam fama ferebat* (now it was rumored, *BC* 3.417). Cf. Masters 1992, 5 n. 12 on the epic *iam.* Cf. Lebek 1976, 116 on the creation of a *Zustand* (fact) by using adverbs like *iam* at the beginning of a sentence.

21. Cf. *cumque alii famae populi terrore paverent* (though other people [but not the Massilians] cowered in terror at his [Caesar's] name, *BC* 3.300).

22. Cf. Leigh 1999 on deforestation and Hinds 1998, 12–14 on poetic "intertextual" forests.

23. Hardie 2008, 318.

with Pompey's battle against Caesar's reputation.[24] On this reading strategy, Lucan's mythological excursus provides us with a new perspective on the nature of the conflict between our two Roman leaders.

We can register a similar impact of *Fama* on the epic plot when Caesar is set on the defeated Pompey's track "with rumor as his guide" (*fama duce*, *BC* 9.953). When Caesar is attracted by the ancient city's renown, *Fama* also seduces him to a side trip to Troy: Caesar's shows himself as *mirator **famae*** (admirer of glory, *BC* 9.961). Shortly afterward not only Caesar's interest in Pompey but also his concern for his own reputation leads him on to Egypt.[25] Caesar acknowledges and exemplifies *Fama*'s workings when he tells the wise man Acoreus: "For sure, I was brought to Pharos's cities by report about my son-in-law, but still report about you, too" (***fama** quidem generi Pharias me duxit ad urbes / sed tamen et vestri*, *BC* 10.184–85). As before in Thessaly, where Erictho and Pompey's son are destined to meet through *Fama*'s designs (*BC* 6.570), here again *Fama* has directed a protagonist toward a knowledge figure, the priest Acoreus. As we have seen, *Fama* has the power to move people—the prime example being "even Eastern retreats were roused by rumor of war" (*movit et Eoos bellorum **fama** recessus*, *BC* 3.229), which is followed by a catalog of foreign tribes, set in motion. *Fama* manifests this power by causing protagonists to react to hearsay regardless of what source this stems from. She thus serves as one of Lucan's favorite narratological devices for directing a plot in which neither reliable sources nor reliable knowledge can be found.[26]

Let me return to *BC* 4 once more, where we bear witness to yet another micro-image of civil war, when Curio and Iuba, deputies of Caesar and Pompey, restage between themselves their leaders' contest. Here again *Fama* plays a decisive role. Initially she causes Curio to tremble before mere hearsay, which prompts him to act (*BC* 4.694). The result is successful at first: Varus is defeated. When this defeat is reported back to Iuba, however, the king seizes the opportunity to enlarge his fame.[27] By attempting to tame his fame, by trying to silence rumor, lest it scare away the enemy, Iuba does something unique to the entire epic (*obscuratque suam per iussa silentia **famam*** "and he [Juba] veils

24. There are of course multiple subtexts. Ahl 1972 points to Virgil's Hercules and Cacus episode. Martindale 1981 sees Hercules' role as Stoic exemplum undermined and mythology subordinated to Lucan's history of civil war. Saylor 1982 identifies both Curio and Juba with Antaeus.

25. Cf. *vertissem Latias a vestro litore proras:/ **famae** cura vetat* (I should have turned my Latian prows from your shore: regard for my reputation stops me, *BC* 9.1079–80).

26. As exemplified by Masters 1992, 134 on Appius and the Delphic oracle: "Nowhere *is* exactly, pointedly, defiantly, where the episode goes, and that at great length."

Fama knows so much more but there is no time to tell it all. Cf. *BC* 2.672 on Xerxes bridging the Hellespont; *BC* 3.215 on Ninos, famous for having been the capital of Assyria in the past; and *BC* 3.220 on the invention of the alphabet.

27. These news arrive not unlike a rumor without mention of source or messenger (*BC* 4.715–16).

report of his approach by imposing silence," *BC* 4.718). This results nevertheless in increasing his fame yet again. The Curio episode in *BC* 4 serves accordingly not only as a micro-image of civil war but also exemplifies once more that *Fama* can be a man's mightiest weapon and that the rivalry for fame between the epic's main protagonists, Caesar and Pompey, is played out at many different levels. Characteristically, then, when the two big names, Caesar and Pompey, finally meet in Illyria, they are first referred to not by name but instead simply as being famous: "this was the place where Fortune matched two names of fame so great" (*hoc Fortuna loco tantae duo nomina **famae** / composuit*, *BC* 5.468–69). At this point in the epic the reader can be expected to have realized whom this must mean.[28] The Curio episode also foreshadows the outcome of the ongoing competition between Caesar and Pompey. Curio is granted fame even though he lies unburied, a topos we encounter again on a larger scale at the death of Pompey.[29]

As we have seen, Caesar in particular engages with *Fama* and employs his reputation successfully in the first half of the epic. Throughout *BC* 8, however, Pompey gradually intensifies his relationship with her. Accordingly his death forms simultaneously both climax and finale in the construction of his renown.[30]

In *BC* 8 *Fama* becomes as much danger and burden for Pompey as she has previously been honor and weapon for Caesar. She turns against Pompey and those he loves. On Pompey's flight from Pharsalus his bygone fame becomes a threat (*BC* 8.10–12). For a moment Pompey even seems to have lost his *Fama*, as he speeds along faster than her in his flight. The people he meets have not yet heard of his defeat: *nondum **fama** prodente ruinas* (when rumor had not yet disclosed his fall, *BC* 8.15). Temporarily Pompey thus has to take over *Fama*'s role and spread the news among those passing by (*cladisque suae vix ipse fidelis / auctor erat* "and he scarcely was believed when he himself reported his defeat," *BC* 8.17–18). Only too soon, however, *Fama* catches up. Now fortune has turned against Pompey and his defeat is aggravated by his fame.[31] All of a sudden Pompey longs to be unknown, only a name—any name.[32]

Before pursuing Pompey's *Fama* further let me examine her relations with his devoted wife, Cornelia. Having styled herself an Alcyone figure who awaits report about her husband while anxiously patrolling the shores, Cornelia fears nothing as much as bad news (*BC* 5.774–75, 5.778–81, and 8.51–52). In the end she learns of Pompey's fate not through words but rather by seeing her de-

28. Cf. Feeney 1986a on the constant play with the title *Magnus* in the *Bellum Civile*.

29. Cf. BC 4.810–13 and *nil ista nocebunt **famae** busta tuae* (in no way will that grave [i.e., the fact that you don't have one] impair your fame, *BC* 8.858–59).

30. Cf. Feeney 1986a, 241.

31. Cf. *Fortuna [. . .] quae tanto pondere **famae** / res premit adversas* (Fortune, who crushes his adversity with his renown's enormous weight, *BC* 8.21–23).

32. Cf. Feeney 1986a, 240. Cf. *ignotus [. . .] esse [. . .] mallet; obscuro [. . .] nomine* (he would rather be unknown; with an obscure name, *BC* 8.19–21).

feated husband: for once *Fama* has spared her. Pompey for his part, although still alive, has survived himself and has become a walking corpse.[33] When the couple are finally reunited, Pompey bestows both his proximity to death and his fame upon Cornelia. Her deathlike fainting (*BC* 8.56–60) stands in for the death she desires, as she is destined to survive her husband (*BC* 8.60–61). Pompey then in finest epic fashion makes her a monument, a memento of his fame: *habes aditum mansurae in saecula* ***famae*** (you have an avenue to fame that will endure for centuries, *BC* 8.74).[34] Accordingly she will one day be renowned as "the former wife of Magnus" and become his living tombstone.[35] Invested with Pompey's fame, Cornelia becomes a mouthpiece of *Fama*, echoing "Magnus" back to Pompey. She mirrors Pompey's language by using *Magnus* twice at the beginning of a verse (*BC* 8.102 and 8.105), while he uses it twice as a verse ending (*BC* 8.80 and 8.84). Thereby she reinstates and reconfirms him in his title of honor. Having secured his own afterlife, Pompey wins back his self-confidence and starts to employ his fame and name to best advantage: *sed me vel sola tueri /* ***fama*** *potest rerum [. . .] et nomen* (But even on its own the fame of my achievements and my name can keep me safe, *BC* 8.274–76). For the moment Pompey seems right back in *Fama*'s favor. His retrospect remarks on his former greatness (*BC* 8.316–21), however, are preceded by an epitaphic gesture (*BC* 8.314–16) that pictures Pompey lying dead in foreign lands and sets *Magnus* on track toward posthumous fame. It comes as no surprise, then, that we encounter *Fama*, and a final spurt toward her, at the very end of Pompey's life in *BC* 8.

As if to provide a foil of contrast for Pompey's good reputation, his murderer is loaded with disrepute, the *Fama* of *nefas* (sacrilege). Lucan marks Septimius as embodiment of *nefas*, of all that is unspeakable (*BC* 8.608–9). Accordingly the poet cannot find a name for the ultimate sacrilege Septimius is about to commit and cloaks it in rhetorical questions (*BC* 8.609–10). In contrast, Pom-

---

33. Cf. *BC* 8.28–29 and *pallore* (pallor, *BC* 8.56). For further instances of paleness *ante mortem* cf. *BC* 2.202 and *BC* 7.129–30.

34. Cf. Hector's words to Andromache that she will be remembered as his wife (*Il.* 6.459–61). She fulfills precisely this role when she reappears in the *Aeneid* (3.303–4) honoring his cenotaph. Pompey's words thus fit the pattern. Cf. also *nunc sum tibi gloria maior* (Now I bring you greater glory, *BC* 8.78). Claassen 1999, 121–22 points out Ovid's attempts to utilize his wife when exiled.

35. Nevertheless she already has—as Pompey rightly remarks—her own "female" fame won through lineage (*BC* 8.72–74). Cornelia's fame—in opposition to Pompey's—is of a passive nature and not won through deeds (*BC* 8.75). Pompey's active fame, too, as soon as it is transferred onto Cornelia, will be transformed into a passive one as she wins it by marriage only (*BC* 8.76). Nevertheless this gift could also generate her doom as she might turn into a trophy wife for Eastern kings (*BC* 8.413).

In contrast Caesar's companion Cleopatra possesses a more active fame. Readers of Lucan must have been well aware of her role in both Roman and (Judeo-)Egyptian propaganda. She carries very much her own story. Cf. Volkmann 1958, 158 ("Octavian's propaganda brought Cleopatra into the foreground and made her the real adversary") and Clauss 1995, 57 on the programmatic naming of Cleopatra's children, 69 for her appearance on Roman coins and 79 on Sib. *Or.* 3.

pey's death is defined by his determination to coin his posthumous reputation. To die bravely is his last obligation in life but also his last chance to exert any influence over his fame: *nunc consule* ***famae*** (think now of your fame, *BC* 8.624). Accordingly, he stages his death as a Stoic spectacle to be marveled at by his son and wife: *natus coniunxque peremptum / si mirantur, amant* (my son and wife, if they admire me in death, love me, *BC* 8.634–35).[36] Pompey willingly silences his own voice lest it interfere with his everlasting fame: *ne quas effundere voces / vellet et aeternam fletu corrumpere* ***famam*** (lest he break into speech and mar his eternal fame with tears, *BC* 8.616–17). Again he shifts death onto his wife, who faints in deathlike manner after delivering a tragic monologue.[37] Even as a dead body Pompey has some fame to bestow. This time it goes to Cordus, who though mentioned only once in the entire epic (*BC* 8.715) nevertheless earns eternal fame for providing Pompey with burial (*quo te Fama loquax omnes accepit in annos* "for this, loquacious fame has welcomed you for all the years to come," *BC* 8.782). Surprisingly Lucan makes a positive of the shabbiness of Pompey's tomb (*BC* 8.859). It will vanish even faster and thus smooth the way for Pompey's posthumous omnipresence.[38] *BC* 8 thus constitutes a crescendo of *Fama*, not unlike thunder growing louder as it approaches. It takes the reader through the entire spectrum of fame from a humbled Pompey on the run at the entrée of the book to a Pompey on his way to eternal fame at its curtain.

Meanwhile the whereabouts of Pompey's severed head soon instigate rumors and succeed in creating *Fama.*[39] Cornelia now fulfills her designated role and carries on Pompey's fame after his death. When she delivers his last will, the frame of her speech makes clear that this is now her only reason for living (*BC* 9.85–86 and 9.98–100).[40] His fame thus lives on and is by itself sufficient to rally an army. It remains Pompey's most powerful weapon.[41] Moreover thanks to gentilician nomenclature, which makes sons perpetuate their father's name, Pompey literally leaves his name to his sons. In this way they are able to capitalize on it for fresh ventures: *inveniet classes quisquis Pompeius in undas veniet* (whichever Pompey comes onto waves will find a fleet, *BC* 9.93–94).

36. Cf. Leigh 1997, 183 n. 36. The notion of Pompey's death as spectacle reappears in Ptolemy's (*BC* 8.687) and Caesar's (9.1035) gazing at his head.

37. Cf. *BC* 8.661–62. Cf. *labor* OLD (7) and *rapitur* cf. OLD (5) for the vocabulary of death in these verses.

38. Cf. 8.865–72. Pompey thus equals Caesar's appearance at Pharsalus, and later in Egypt (*BC* 10.488), which creates "den verschwommenen Eindruck einer Allgegenwart" (Glaesser 1984, 63–64).

39. Cf. *haec* ***fama*** *est* (it is said [about the head], *BC* 9.139). In *BC* 9.1029–30 Pompey's decapitation is already firmly established as subject of *Fama.*

40. Cf. Keith 2008 for an analysis of Cornelia's lament.

41. Cf. *vel sceptra vel urbes / [. . .] impellite* ***fama*** */ nominis* (by the glory of my [Pompey's] name, impel the scepters or the cities, *BC* 9.90–92).

In what follows the epic's action is relocated to an area filled with fame. We return to Libya, which we have visited before in *BC* 4, and are given a mythological supplement to the Hercules and Antaeus episode when we are told about the garden of the Hesperides (BC 9.347–67). This time, however, it is no unnamed local (as will also be the case at Caesar's visit to Troy) but the authorial voice itself that plays the *guide* as mouthpiece of *Fama*. The reader is instantly pointed to *Fama*, as this passage shows the highest density of occurrences of the word *fama* in the entire epic: four times in 63 lines.[42] In addition Lucan thematizes *Fama* in an authorial comment on the truthfulness of rumored traditions: *invidus annoso qui* ***famam*** *derogat aevo / qui vates ad vera vocat* (spiteful is anyone who takes away from aged time its glory, who summons poets to the truth, *BC* 9.359–60). We can then hardly fail to remember that we have listened to the *fama* of this place before. Lucan even inserts another pointer to *BC* 4 when he refers to Iuba's kingdom as known by rumor (*nulla iacet tellus quam* ***fama*** *cognita nobis / tristia regna Iubae* "there lies no land except the dismal realm of Juba, known to us by rumor," *BC* 9.868–69).

Last but not least the fame Scaeva has earned in *Bellum Civile* 6 will come to conclude the extant text, serving as epilogue and final signal of one of the epic's key concepts.[43] Whether or not Lucan really chose to end his epic on this ringing note on fame and afterlife, we may never know.[44] However, if this epic can bestow eternal fame on both Caesar and Pompey, it should provide the same much-desired service for the poet Lucan.

What is more, *Fama*'s ever-shifting form and definition are present in her conceptualization as both fame and rumor, paradoxically uniting validity with vanity.[45] Lucan points to this inherent ambiguity when all of a sudden he asks what military fame is worth when brought face to face with Cato's *virtus*? *quis Marte secundo, quis tantum meruit populorum sanguine nomen*? (Who has earned a name so mighty by favorable battle, who by blood of nations? [in comparison to Cato], *BC* 9.596–97).[46] By questioning the preeminence of Pompey's and Caesar's fame, which has been won through military deeds, Lucan extends

42. Cf. *BC* 9.348 and 9.356 *ut* ***fama*** (the legend goes), 9.359 (cited below n. 77) and 9.411–12 *si credere* ***famae*** */ cuncta velis* (if you want to trust in rumor altogether). This frequency is only rivaled by *BC* 2, which provides four occurrences of the word *fama* in a hundred lines but no further instances in the rest of the book.

43. Cf. Masters 1992, 257–59. For Scaeva's fame cf. *felix hoc nomine* ***famae*** ([Scaeva] happy in this claim to fame, *BC* 6.257) and *Scaevam perpetuae meritum iam nomina* ***famae*** ([Caesar sees] Scaeva, who already had earned the fame of everlasting glory, *BC* 10.544).

44. Cf. also *potuit discrimine summo / Caesaris una dies in* ***famam*** *et saecula mitti* (That single day could have passed into glory and the centuries because of Caesar's utmost danger, *BC* 10.532–33).

45. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.39–63 (House of *Fama*).

46. Cf. Sklenar 2003,101–52 on the contested concept of *virtus* in Lucan's epic.

this question to the fame of the epic poet himself. For as we have seen Lucan not only guarantees the fame of the military leaders with his epic but also links his own renown to theirs.[47] Lucan, however, plays it safe—by quickly siding with Cato as well.

> *hunc ego per Syrtes Libyaeque extrema triumphum /*
> *ducere maluerim, quam ter Capitolia curru /*
> *scandere Pompei, quam frangere colla Jugurthae*
>
> [This triumphal march through the Syrtes and remotest parts of Libya I would rather make than climb the Capitol three times with Pompey's chariot, than break Jugurtha's neck.] (*BC* 9.598–600)

This move gives us a further hint about the priorities set out for his opus: fame is the main concern.

After having pursued *fama* through the entire epic, we can now grasp more firmly what there is in Lucan's epic that is worth fighting for, dying for, and writing for. In an epic that arguably can be read as being all about *Fama*, this principle constitutes both narratological method and—as I will argue—substitutes for the traditional "control level."[48] Accordingly the epic's quest does not so much demand fulfillment of what Fate has decreed for Rome—for this cannot be prevented any more. Rather it consists of a textualized struggle for fame. In a nutshell, Lucan writes an epic of *Fama* as opposed to Virgil's epic of *Fatum*.

In what follows I shall examine whether Lucan employs a *Fama* figure that can be seen as replacing Jupiter in his traditional role as epic "control level" and explore in detail the distribution of narratological power in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*.

Erictho as *Fama* Figure: *da nomina rebus, da loca, da vocem* (*BC* 6.773–74)

Epic is to be read as a discourse of power. For an epic plot, an author needs to invent an epic hero, who establishes his own power by fulfilling a quest. Second, he needs a "control level," usually gods or their agents, who as already established force ideally signpost the destination of the epic journey with prodigies

47. Virgil asks a similar question in *Aeneid* 9 at the end of the Nisus and Euryalus episode (if question it is), *si quid mea carmina possunt* (if my songs have any power, 9.446), which can be put to the entire epic. Cf. Fowler 2000, 110.

48. Cf. Lowe 2000, 165 for this term.

and prophecies or at least act as its driving forces. In this way gods supply narratological power by providing the epic with a sense of direction. They are an important source of knowledge for both the reader and the hero, who without them might easily lose direction. Moreover, the gods frame the epic narrative by putting a single man's fate into a wider cosmic context; they help to define the epic world. For the *Aeneid*, Norden famously proposed that "God leads through chaos with wise providence."[49] Subsequently Jupiter and Juno have been established as the *Aeneid*'s main narratological power figures.[50] Moreover recent studies have shown that the *Metamorphoses*, as well, derive their narratological force from the gods, especially Jupiter and Juno.[51] And even for Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, an epic world without gods, this scheme can apply in much the same way. Fantham demonstrates how Caesar, "the *fulmen*" (thunderbolt), is the embodiment of Juno's and Jupiter's divine anger.[52] The aim of this section is to suggest how Jupiter's position, the role of the figure that has knowledge of fate, is negotiated by Lucan in view of the prominence and importance of *Fama* in his epic. I will thus review how Lucan substitutes the "control level" in his uncontrollable epic. First, however, let me examine in what direction he points his readers on their search for knowledge.

Toward Pharsalus

On the journey through Lucan's epic world the reader is bombarded with prophecies, the usual source of information for epic protagonists and reader alike.[53] In the *Bellum Civile* the list of prodigies in *BC* 1.522–83 already makes it clear that there is nothing good to come. Then Arruns is asked to perform an extispicy in order to gain some knowledge (*BC* 1.584–638). The outcome is unspeakable, though it lacks any precise content: *non fanda timemus* (unutterable are the things we fear, *BC* 1.634. The astrologer Nigidius Figulus at last gives a name to the evil: civil war (*BC* 1.672). It will be long and lead to despotism (*BC* 1.668–70). Now we know more, but not yet enough. The climax is given to the *matrona furens* (raging matron, *BC* 1.673–95). She provides a miniature

49. "Gott führt mit weiser Vorsehung durch das Chaos" (Norden 1917, 4).

50. Feeney 1991, 137–38.

51. Wheeler 2000, 70–106.

52. Fantham 2003, developing ideas of Rosner-Siegel 1983, 167.

53. O'Hara 1990 and Feeney 1986b provide a pessimistic reading of the prophecies in the *Aeneid.* In the *Bellum Civile* prophecies herald either nothing relevant at all or tell of *nefas* (sacrilege). They thematize egocentricity in a world where citizens fail to act as a community. But as Albrecht 1999, 281 and Masters 1992, 194 have shown, Lucan is not simply an anti-Virgil, but more of an ultra-Virgil who extends Virgil's already inherent ambiguities.

overview of the entire war.[54] This—thanks to Lucan's tendentious geographical inaccuracy—gives the epic its spin toward Emathia.[55]

In *BC* 5—much closer to Pharsalus—we finally approach Delphi, a place whose mantic tradition must raise great expectations in a reader searching for information.[56] Nevertheless the Delphic oracle fails to be a source of knowledge. It does of course, if only very briefly, answer the question of Appius. But does it provide anything of relevance that would help us understand the wider dimensions of the epic? No, for the answer is on the smallest possible scale, revealing Appius's own fate alone. One reason for this reticence might be found by examining the metapoetic content of the passage: the oracle cannot answer Appius's question about an ending (***finem****que expromere rerum / sollicitat superos* "He [Appius] stirs the gods to disclose the outcome," *BC* 5.68–69) simply because there is no answer, or at least not only one.[57] Lucan's "negative re-writing of the *Aeneid*" reaches its telos in book 6.[58] Afterward the epic loses all sense of direction.[59] In the end the epic raises the question about the end itself: *nam quis erit* ***finis*** *si nec Pharsalia pugnae / nec Pompeius erit?* (What end to battle will there be if it is not Pharsalia or Pompey? *BC* 9.232–33). In order to create a particular anti-Aeneidean structure, Lucan's epic has reversed the sequel of the *Aeneid*'s "Odyssean" half, in which the hero wanders around, and the "Iliadic"

54. On the relative silence—considering what could be said—of all three prophecies cf. Masters 1992, 185.

55. This geographical inaccuracy looks back to a literary tradition; cf. Virg. *Georg.* 1.489–92 and Ov. *Met.* 15.823–24. The idea of melding together Pharsalus and Philippi serves two purposes: it frames the matrona's prophecy in a ring-composition and gives the reader the feeling that wherever we go, we shall end up at Philippi = Emathia = Pharsalus. Emathia is a correct alternative for Philippi; in the *Bellum Civile*, however, this term is also regularly (and incorrectly) applied as if it included Pharsalus, thus linking the two battlefields together throughout the epic. It provides the opportunity for Lucan to pile even future *nefas* on Thessaly. Cf. *BC* 7.591–92 and 871–72.

56. For a detailed discussion of this passage cf. Masters 1992, 91–149.

57. Wheeler 2000, 110 raises the topic of multiple endings (and beginnings) in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Masters 1992, 2 shows that Lucan creates multiple beginnings. By refusing to give the second part of his epic (or at least what we have of it) a sense of closure, a telos, Lucan creates multiple endings as well. Pompey's death (*BC* 8) could easily have stood as the end, or even Caesar triumphantly looking at Pompey's head (*BC* 9). Furthermore Lucan might have created a Virgilian ending by promising Pompey's apotheosis—or ended in Ovidian manner with *BC* 9.1–18 depicting it. Moreover Lucan also plays with the possibility of an abrupt end: [Caesar:] *spes sit mihi certa videndi Niliacos fontes, bellum civile relinquam* (Let me have a hope assured of seeing the springs of Nile, and I will abandon civil war, *BC* 10.191–92).

58. Hardie 1993, 118.

59. Cf. the many suggestions where to go in the *consilium BC* 8.277–78: *Libyam Parthosque Pharonque, quemnam Romanis deceat succurrere rebus* (Libya and the Parthians and Pharos, which ruler best can help the Roman state). Furthermore Cato refuses to consult an oracle, which could have provided new orientation (*BC* 9.566).

one, in which the hero has defined his quest and fights for its fulfillment.[60] The result is a deliberate "endlessness" of the epic.[61]

Fas (lawfulness) has no power to give information in this epic of *nefas* (sacrilege). As we realize, in the *Bellum Civile* narratological energy comes not from heaven but exclusively from hell.[62] Lucan ostentatiously does not rely on the usual epic props of prophecy and oracle to direct his epic. Instead mantic silence drives the epic toward Emathia. Cheated of their expectations once more at Delphi, the readers arrive at *BC* 6—a book that feeds the hope in all those who have read the *Aeneid* of finding a proper, authorized source of information. However, besides the model provided by Virgil, there is also Ovidian inspiration at work here.[63] In what follows I shall examine the influence Ovid's memorable personification of *Fama* has exerted on *BC* 6.

Personifications

Personifications, by the time Lucan wrote the *Bellum Civile*, were a long-established trope of epic poets. Hesiod's *Theogony* and Homer's epics feature numerous examples. Still, to become allegorical personifications, "characterful agents who engage with human beings, occupying the same narrative space as the human characters, and interacting with them in the same way as do the gods themselves," they had to wait for Virgil and especially for Ovid's *Invidia* (Envy), *Fames* (Hunger), *Somnus* (Sleep), and *Fama* (Rumor).[64] With Lucan's abolition of the Olympian gods, however, personifications seem to have gone the same way because of their affiliation with the *apparatus deorum* and their role as mediators between gods and men.[65] Nevertheless it is unlikely that Lucan's poetic production can have stayed innocent of and uninfluenced by Ovid's powerful and memorable creations.[66] Indeed, given the prominence of *Fama* in Lucan's epic, I must pay special attention to Ovid's *Fama*.

---

60. On Lucan's relation to Virgil and Homer in general cf. Narducci 1985 and Lausberg 1985.

61. Masters 1992, 258 defends the final verses as the intended epilogue.

62. Hardie 1993, 60–65.

63. On Ovid's influence on Lucan in general cf. Albrecht 1999, 224–27.

64. Cf. Feeney 1991, 241.

65. Even though "at times, particularly in the first book, [. . .] Lucan flirts with the possibility that supernatural characters will play a role in the narrative" (Feeney 1991, 270). Cf. Hömke 1998, 129 on the personification of *Roma* in *BC* 1.183–203.

66. Personifications found their way into Christian literature with ease; cf. Gombrich 1971. Vessey 1973, 316 concludes his examination of Statius's "*Clementia*" by constructing an almost Christian allegory: "The *Thebaid* ends with the triumph of virtue over sin." In Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, however, personifications serve to demonstrate precisely the opposite.

In the *Metamorphoses* Ovid picks up Virgil's lead and creates a powerful knowledge-figure in *Fama*, often translated as *rumor*, but also a personification of *kleos* (fame), the epic tradition and generally the spoken word. Her genealogy sets her up in direct opposition to Jupiter, for *Fama* is born from Earth in answer to Jupiter's blasting of her other gigantic children. In addition an association with thunder goes with both Jupiter and *Fama*, as she grows like a thunder that comes rolling from a distance, and both characters can spread fear and terror.[67] Already in her Virgilian incarnation in *Aeneid* 4 *Fama* shares many features with the father of the gods. What is more, Virgil already depicts her as maleficent and thus as a suitable agent for Lucan's world perverted by civil war: *Fama malum qua non aliud velocius ullum* (Rumor the swiftest of all evils, *Aen.* 4.174).[68] In an epic where Jupiter's position is vacant she thus arguably provides a possible alternative casting. Therefore I suggest that it will be worthwhile watching out for a *Fama* figure in Lucan's epic.

Fama*'s Landscape*

In the *Metamorphoses* Ovid describes not only the persona he creates through personification but also the place where it lives or stays. He thereby provides his protagonists with a context and places them in a setting. As a result, Ovid's geographical ekphraseis are not without significance and tell much about those who inhabit them. Homer's technique of introducing new characters to Odysseus only after a description of the landscape they inhabit is not dissimilar.[69] The important role landscape plays in the epics of Homer, Virgil, and Ovid then lies in the connection between landscape and the human action performed in it.[70] The environment here often serves as narrative mirror and metapoetic matrix. In the case of the Ovidian *Fama* the depiction of her house even serves as a substitute for her own bodily manifestation.[71] For this reason we should expect landscape to play a major role in constructing Lucan's version of a *Fama* figure in *Bellum Civile* 6 as well.

Lucan supplies Thessaly with the topography of a *locus horridus* (terrible

67. Cf. Hardie 1999, 103 n. 40. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.175 with the subtext of Lucr. *DRN* 6.340–42, and also Ov. *Met.* 12.49–52, on which see further below. For fear and horror cf. *Aen.* 4.187 and 12.851–52. In addition *Fama* "inflames" (*incendit*) Juba just like Jupiter's lightning (*Aen.* 4.197).

68. Hardie 1986, 276–78 and Hardie 1999, 97–98 point to similarities between *Fama* and the Furies, especially Allecto. Ovid is less outspoken in assigning her to the evil side but still depicts "Error, unfounded Joy and panic Fear" (*Met.* 12.59–60) as part of the house of *Fama.*

69. Cf. Race 1993, 91 and 95.

70. Cf. Segal 1969 and Leach 1988, 27–73.

71. Cf. Braun 1991.

place) and creates a geography of war.[72] *Fama* and Fate have left the place with a local mythology of destruction in which Hercules is the most prominent figure. The stations of Hercules' own destruction—Achelous (*BC* 6.363–64), Nessus (6.365, 6.391–92) and Philoctetes (6.535–36)—foreshadow the defeat of Pompey, as whose divine patron Hercules served.[73] Hercules' destruction of mountains clears the Flood so that Emathia emerges (*BC* 6.347–48) and the gigantomachy, which is mentioned here to construct Thessaly as a prototypical locus for transgression, shows Hercules helping to establish the world of the Olympian gods (*BC* 6.410–12).[74] In the forthcoming fight between *Magni* (great names), however, Hercules will side with the loser. In addition the Trojan War, which took off from Thessaly, provides a model for and actually foreshadows Rome's downfall (*BC* 6.350–52).[75] Lucan also undertakes some geographical labor in order to relocate Agave and the head of Pentheus (*BC* 6.357–59) in Thessaly, an unmistakable pointer to Pompey's severed *caput* (head).[76] Furthermore the cultural achievements of Thessaly are all *semina Martis* (seeds of war, *BC* 6.395–407). The presence of horses, ships (the instruments of war), and money (the reason for war) all point toward the martial "iron age."[77] What is more, Thessaly's darkness, lack of wind, and Stygian river Titaresos make it an apt substitute for the underworld. *Fama* and Fate have prepared this place for war and directed the protagonists and the reader.[78] As these surroundings provide the best possible background for all sorts of *nefas* (sacrilege), Pompey appears on a well-prepared stage.[79] Accordingly, this ominous landscape, a topographical double for Pompey's destruction, raises great expectations. It virtually screams for a power figure. And Erictho, whom we meet here, turns out to be the place's

---

72. Schiesaro 1985 coins this term. The words *opponit* ([the mountain] he opposes, *BC* 6.336), *premuntur* ([mountains] they press, *BC* 6.343), *ruinam* (fall, *BC* 6.348), *maculatus sanguine*, *secat*, and *ferit* ([the river] stained with blood; [the river] cleaves; [the river] strikes, *BC* 6.364–65) all appear in conjunction with mountains and rivers.

73. *Hercules invictus* (Hercules invincible) was Pompey's motto at Pharsalus (cf. Appian *BC* 2.76).

74. In Hercules' fight with the giant Antaeus (*BC* 4.593–653)—even though located *non Phlegraeis arvis* (not on Phlegran fields [the location of the battle of gods and giants], *BC* 4.597)—we are actually confronted with a miniature gigantomachy.

75. Masters 1992, 158 remarks how the chronologically "last" epic in history returns here to the geographical starting point of the *Iliad.*

76. Cf. Masters 1992, 161–62 and 173–74. In addition we find Lucan alluding to Ovid's violent centaur battle (*BC* 6.388–91). Cf. Korenjak 1996, *ad loc.* for trees as weapons in *BC* 6.389 and *Met.* 12.512–13.

77. Cf. Nicolai 1989, 130.

78. Cf. *movit . . . fama bellorum* (the rumor of war roused [the East], *BC* 3.229*). Fama* causes soldiers to march toward Pharsalus.

79. Cf. *contigit Emathiam, bello quam fata parabant* ([Pompey] reached Emathia, which the Fates were preparing for war, *BC* 6.332). For the staginess of Pharsalus cf. Leigh 1997, 77–110.

very essence. The mighty wicked witch and omniscient mistress of black arts has long been recognized as the most prominent and powerful female persona in the *Bellum Civile*.[80] Indeed it seems as if part of her power derives from her setting. As the House of Fame stands for *Fama*, Thessaly stands for Erictho. She is designed to embody landscape; for the name Erictho occurs only four times and she is labeled *Thessala* instead.[81] On many counts, then, Erictho has the strongest claim to launch our enquiry into epic personification and an investigation of Ovidian inspiration for Lucan's powerful *Fama* figure in *Bellum Civile* 6.

How to Create a Power Figure

Many well-known horror figures have already been put forward as models for Erictho: Medea in Ovid and Seneca; Ovid's *Invidia*; the Hellenistic fiend Lamia; Hecate and Gaia; Horace's Canidia; and Virgil's Allecto.[82] Some even suspect a literary version of Nero's poisoner Locusta.[83] At any rate, the creation of a unique and impressive character in Erictho out of all these models is a striking Lucanism.[84] We have already observed the prominent connection between personifications and their surroundings. Thus, to boost the ancestry of Erictho's narratological power I shall point to resemblances between the witch in her Thessalian landscape, and Ovid's personification of *Fama* and her home. As I will argue, Eritctho's extraordinary powers have much to do with the fact that she incorporates so many traces of the Virgilian and Ovidian *Fama*.

Fama *and Erictho*

As we shall see, Erictho's resemblances to *Fama* are striking. However, as Ovid does not actually depict *Fama* physically, but instead takes pains to locate her,

80. Erictho has therefore prompted constant scholarly interest; for an overview cf. Masters 1992, 179 n. 1, and more recently Korenjak 1996 and Hömke 1998.

81. The name Erictho appears in *BC* 6.508, 6.640, 6.725, 6.826. *Thessala* is used as substitute for "Erictho" in *BC* 6.519, 6.628, and 6.762; moreover both *Thessalis* (*BC* 6.565, 6.605) and *Thessala vates* (*BC* 6.651) are employed.

82. Gordon 1978, 239–40 points to *Invidia*, but more detailed examination is required. Cf. Fauth 1975, 333 on the chthonic goddesses Hecate and Gaia. For Canidia cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.8, *Epod.* 5 and 17. She, too, is a *Fama* figure; cf. Oliensis 1991, 110. Cf. n. 82 on Allecto and Hardie 1993, 76–77.

83. Korenjak 1996, 22.

84. Cf. Johnson 1987, 20 for eulogy.

the reader must deduce her features from her environment. Ovid describes her setting in the *Metamorphoses* as follows:

> *Orbe locus medio est inter terrasque fretumque*
> *caelestesque plagas, triplicis confinia mundi*
>
> [There is a place between land and sea, the meeting point of the threefold universe.] (*Met.* 12.39–40)

Fama lives at the focal point of the world, where the elements—sea, sky, and earth—meet. She resides in an elevated place, from which everything can be seen and heard (*Met.* 12.43). She thus occupies two positions of supreme power: the center and the top. Likewise Erictho is first seen by Sextus in a similarly elevated position (*BC* 6.575). On close examination, Thessaly, where Erictho resides, is indeed construed by Lucan as the new center of the sublime epic world. It is a land near the sea, whose summits—according to Lucan's own tendentious description—include with Mt. Olympus a mountain, which even in a world without gods is associated with heaven. The threefold universe meets in Thessaly. Furthermore the local witches are able to drag down the stars and moon from heaven so that these heavenly bodies finally come to touch the earth (*BC* 6.499–500 and 505). In addition "the place where Erictho performs necromancy can be securely located neither in the world above nor the world below."[85] Thessaly thus also serves as a terrestrial substitute for the underworld of *Aeneid* 6.[86] Thessaly is an *interlocus*, the ultimate in-between place. Moreover, as the people of the entire world follow Caesar and Pompey into battle, the world meets in Thessaly, and Thessaly thus unites the world in one place.[87] What is more, Lucan transfers the mythological and political centers of the world to Thessaly. After he has demonstrated the dysfunction of the Delphic oracle, a place usually traded as the geographical middle of the world, he now points to its roots. The place from which the Python arose and the laurel supply for Delphi comes is Thessaly (*BC* 6.407), from here the oracle derives its mantic power. In addition, Pompey refuses to return to Italy and claims that Thessaly will serve him as a substitute for Rome, the center of the empire. To avoid fighting the civil war in the *Forum Romanum*, the world's political center,

85. Hardie 1993, 77.

86. Masters 1992, 188.

87. Cf. *acciperet felix ne non semel omnia Caesar, / vincendum pariter Pharsalia praestitit orbem* (to ensure that lucky Caesar received everything at one stroke, Pharsalia offered him the world to be conquered all at once, *BC* 3. 296–97).

he migrates to Thessaly (*BC* 6.323). Here civil war is supplied with a new, wider forum. What is more, *Fama* is well embedded in this landscape and already at work in Thessaly: *fama est* (she is there, *BC* 6.378). As a result, she directs Sextus to Erictho (*hanc ut fama loci Pompeio prodidit* "when local rumor revealed her to Pompey," *BC* 6.570). And at one point our *Fama* figure Erictho even meets her fame and delights in hearing her own reputation (*inpia laetatur volgato nomine famae / Thessalis* "the wicked witch of Thessaly delights in her fame's renown so widely spread," *BC* 6.604–5).

A further characteristic of the Ovidian house of *Fama* is the presence of Fear.[88] Intimidation is a métier in which Erictho feels at home as well. Her appearance alone spreads utter horror (*BC* 6.515–18) and she easily arouses fear in Sextus and his companions (*BC* 6.659 and 666). In the same way that *Fama*'s home resounds with a mixture of confused voices and noises, the *Fama* figure Erictho resounds with a multitude of voices:[89]

> *tum vox . . .*
> *confundit murmura primum*
> *dissona et humanae multum discordia linguae.*
> *latratus habet illa canum gemitusque luporum,*
> *quod trepidus bubo, quod strix nocturna queruntur,*
> *quod strident ululantque ferae, quod sibilat anguis*
> *exprimit et planctus illisae cautibus undae*
> *silvarumque sonum fractaeque tonitrua nubis.*
> *tot rerum vox una fuit*

> [Then her voice, first composed of jumbled noises, jarring, utterly discordant with human speech—the bark of dogs and howl of wolves, the owl's cry of alarm, the screech owl's nighttime moan, the wild beasts' shriek and wail, the serpent's hiss—it utters, too, the beating of the cliff-smashed wave, the sound of forests, and the thunderings of the fissured cloud; of so many noises was one voice the source.] (*BC* 6.685–93)

Despite all this Erictho manages to unify all of these sounds into a single voice (*BC* 6.693), not dissimilar to the way in which rumor, *Fama*'s voice, is distilled from many. Indeed *Fama*'s Virgilian representation thematizes this when de-

88. Cf. *vanaque Laetitia est consternatique* ***Timores*** (and here [in the House of *Fama*] is unfounded Joy and panic Fear, *Met.* 12.60).

89. Cf. *tota fremit vocesque refert iteratque quod audit* (the whole place is full of noises, repeats all words, and doubles what it hears, *Met.*12.47) and *Met.* 12.53–55.

picting her with a multitude of tongues.[90] Erictho, too, has a remarkable penchant for tongues and eagerly collects them together.[91] As in Latin the word for tongue (*lingua*) is virtually the reification of speech, this again is an image of Erictho's many voices. In addition, like *Fama* Erictho is a poet figure.[92] As such she invents and tries out her own new poetic production.[93]

In Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Erysicthon provides a body for *Fames* (Hunger). By infecting Erysicthon with insatiable hunger the personification of *Fames* becomes a split divinity. *Fames* employs an "interaction between personification and victim, simplified by Ovid, followed by Statius, of the kind: 'She breathes herself into the man.'"[94] For her part, when Erictho interacts with her victim, she breathes *murmura* (murmurs) into it and *nefas* (sacrilege): *gelidis infudit* ***murmura*** *labris / arcanumque* ***nefas*** *Stygias mandavit ad umbras* (she pours mumbles into icy lips and sends mysterious horror to the Stygian shades, *BC* 6.568–69). Murmur forms a key element of magic practices.[95] However, *murmura* also constitute an essential part of the house of *Fama*.[96] Thus if Erictho, too, follows the set model and she breathes her very essence into the man, she reveals herself as an incarnation of *Fama mala*.

Ovid's *Fama* is an all-inclusive knowledge figure who sees all that is done and hears all that is said (*Met.* 12.62–63). In fact Lucan's Erictho is just as well informed as *Fama*: She can trace events from the world's beginning and knows the workings of fate (*BC* 6.611–12). This, however, is precisely the office of Jupiter in both the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses.* Thus in this respect—we remember *Fama*'s chthonic descent—Erictho builds up the *Fama*-Jupiter tension more sharply. Indeed, her invocations feature a noticeably disrespectful tone toward the gods (*BC* 6.730–49). Out of fear they quickly grant whatever Erictho asks for.[97] Lucan tells of the Thessalian witches' extraordinary powers just before

90. Cf. *cui quot sunt corpore plumae, / tot vigils oculi subter . . . / tot linguae, totidem ora sonant, tot subrigit auris* ([*Fama*], often she bites off the tip of the tongue, which sticks to a parched throat, Virg. *Aen.* 4.181–83).

91. Cf. *saepe . . . siccoque haerentem gutture linguam / praemordens* (often she bites off the tip o tongue which to parched throat, *BC* 6.564–68).

92. Cf. O'Higgins 1988, 218–19 and Masters 1992, 206 for Erictho as poet figure and and Hardie 2002a, 236 on *Fama.*

93. Cf. *incognita verba / temptabat carmenque novos fingebat in usus* (she was trying out words unknown and shaping a spell [*carmen*] for novel purposes, *BC* 6.577–78).

94. Hardie 1999, 97. Cf. also Segal 2000, 48 on Tisiphone (*Met.* 4.495). Solodow 1988, 94–96 introduces the term "split divinity" to describe Ovid's depictions of Hunger and Envy.

95. On the significance of murmur in magic cf. Baldini Moscadi 1976, 58.

96. Cf. *nec tamen est clamor, sed parvae* ***murmura*** *vocis* (there is no loud clamor, but only the subdued murmur of voices, *Met.* 12.49).

97. Cf. *omne nefas superi prima iam voce precantis / concedunt carmenque timent audire secundum* (The gods above grant every wickedness to her at her first utterance of prayer: they dread to

Erictho is introduced (*BC* 6.492–99). To her he then ascribes exceptional dark powers. Dismissing the other witches because of their excessive piety (*nimia pietas*), Erictho styles herself as an "über-witch" reaching new heights in the art of dark magic (*BC* 6.507–10). In addition, the witches trouble Jupiter as they take over the business of weather-making and steal his thunder. The god is left to wonder what is happening (*legi non paruit aether . . . Iuppiter urgens / miratur non ire polos . . . et tonat ignaro caelum Iove* "the ether does not obey his law, and as Jupiter drives on the sky he is amazed that it does not move and heaven thunders without Jupiter knowing," *BC* 6.462–67). As we have seen above, Erictho incorporates thunder into her powerful voice to conjure up the gods of the underworld (*BC* 6.692–93). That she takes over the thunderbolt from Jupiter seems the ultimate empowerment of a poet figure. Lucan fills the role of *Iuppiter Tonans* with Erictho, who seems to have forces at her command that rival those of a dark goddess (*non superi, non vita vetat* "she is not prevented by the gods or life [from knowing the secrets of the underworld]," *BC* 6.515).

Since Erictho has been invested with such superior power, the reader builds up great expectations for her mantic performance. In line with this the prophecy of the dead body is introduced as *the* source of information and at the same time dismisses all that has been uttered before. A sequence of assurances insists that this time there shall be certainty:[98]

> *tripodas vatesque deorum*
> *sors obscura decet; certus discedat, ab umbris*
> *quisquis vera petit duraeque oracula mortis*
> *fortis adit.*
>
> [The tripods and the prophets of the gods are graced with obscure answers; he who seeks the truth from ghosts and approaches bravely the oracles of relentless death, let him leave certain.] (*BC* 6.770–73)

Finally, who listens to the prophecy? Sextus's reaction to the corpse's utterance is not reported, and this signposts that it is not only voiced for him but also for us. Nonetheless Sextus plays an important role precisely because he will remain unimportant. For Sextus will not inherit his father's name, Magnus. Ovid tells Sextus's end in the *Metamorphoses* and makes clear that the "great"

---

hear a second spell, *BC* 6.527–28).

98. Masters 1992, 196–98 points to *certum* (certain, *BC* 6.592), *aditus ad verum* (paths to truth, *BC* 6.616–17), *plena voce, nec incertum* (loud and clear, *BC* 6.622–23), *omnia canat* (let him foretell all, *BC* 6.716–17) and finally *addidit et carmen, quo, quidquid consulit, umbram scire dedit* ([She also added also a spell] to empower the shade to know whatever she asks, *BC* 6.775–76).

figure of his generation will be Augustus. He is the heir of Caesar's name, a new Magnus, while Sextus dies in disgrace.[99] In the *Bellum Civile* Sextus will only be a shadow of his father's fame, as *Magno proles indigna parente* (a son unworthy of his parent Magnus [Pompey], *BC* 6.420). Sextus carries on from Pompey, who himself is famously described as *magni nominis umbra* (a shadow of a great name, *BC* 1.135). Accordingly Sextus incarnates fading *Fama* and serves as living proof that *Fama* can be nothing but empty air.[100]

Masters sees the corpse's prophecy as yet another disappointment: "the ghost will at least tell us which side will win. That, however, is all."[101] In the end it diverts Sextus to a *certior vates* (a surer prophet, *BC* 6.813), his father Pompey. I myself am not too disappointed, as the vatic team of Erictho and the corpse does its best when offering reports of what other shades have seen and told (*BC* 6.779), thus distributing secondhand knowledge. We come to know hearsay and rumor—the prophecy is part of *Fama* herself, which the *Fama* figure Erictho helps spreading.

Due to Erictho's dominion over the boundaries of time, past, present, and future seem to become indistinct in the Erictho episode and Thessaly is peopled by the dead, the dying, the soon to die.[102] The prophecy gives her the opportunity to prove that she has indeed means to know the future, but also helps to integrate the past into the present civil war. In *Aeneid* 6 Anchises' prophecy looks into the future, to the forthcoming foundation and glory of Rome. The corpse's prophecy looks back to this future and shows how history had always divided the Romans into two parties.[103] It demonstrates that all of Rome's history can be read in Pharsalian terms as a battle between *optimates* and *populares.* Pharsalus is thus the culmination of ever-inherent Roman conflict. Erictho's extraordinary power then stems from the fact that she confounds the roles of Allecto, the hellish force from the underworld in *Aeneid* 7, and of Anchises, mouthpiece of *Fatum* and *Fama* in *Aeneid* 6. She transgresses the line between the two halves of the *Aeneid* that kept these two figures apart while combining their power. Similarly, Erictho forms a bridge between *Bellum Civile* 6 and 7: she embodies the *nefas* (sacrilege) Lucan does not want to spell out when he describes the battle. It is the evening before that tells about the battle, not the battle itself. For there Lucan ostentatiously renounces his topic (*BC* 7.552–54).

---

99. Cf. *cui nominis heres* (he [Augustus] as successor to the name, *Met* 15.819); . . . ***magnum*** *Siculis* ***nomen*** *superabitur undis* (he of the great name [Sextus Pompeius] shall be overcome by Sicilian waters, *Met.* 15.825).

100. Cf. Hardie 2002a, 237.

101. Masters 1992, 199.

102. O'Higgins 1988, 219. Cf. also Hömke 1998, 120.

103. Masters 1992, 193.

In Lucan's *Bellum Civile* the search for gods or supernatural powers, which at first sight seem to be excluded, has prompted a burst of scholarship. Le Bonniec suggested taking *fatum/fortuna* (fate/fortune) for *dei/superi* (gods/deities), while Williams points to the personified *Fortuna* as a faded substitute for the *apparatus deorum.*[104] Feeney fills the gap with Nero, "the perfect presiding deity for the new, quintessential Roman poetry," Ahl with Cato.[105] Finally Due suggests that the survival of Lucan's epic during the Christian Middle Ages might ironically be a consequence of the absence of a cast-list of pagan gods.[106]

Lucan follows two of Ovid's tendencies at the end of the *Metamorphoses*: first he constructs—like Ovid in his sphragis—a godlike poet figure.[107] He puts the poet on stage and invests him with extraordinary power, thereby demonstrating his own poetic self-consciousness. Second, by cutting out the traditional *corpus deorum*, Lucan makes space for the next generation of gods. Wheeler has observed that at the end of the *Metamorphoses* the Ovidian gods play not the role of lovers but that of parents: Jupiter, Mars, and Venus are all concerned with the deification of their children.[108] In my opinion Caesar is a representative of the next generation of gods. We should remember that his apotheosis forms one of the final episodes in the *Metamorphoses.* In the *Bellum Civile* Caesar's godlike status is on view when he cuts down a sacred grove but is not punished (*BC* 3.426).[109] In the end many modern readers of Lucan seem to forget that the Roman contemporary audience will have perceived divine Caesars as the norm and Pompey merely as one of the figures from a republican past.

In this chapter, I have broadened the criteria for this search and looked, more generally, for a "power figure." I have suggested that Erictho, Lucan's most powerful figure, is heavily influenced by Ovid's personifications of *Fama.*[110] She thus comes close to providing a body for *Fama* who spins her net throughout the epic and is one of its driving forces.

104. Le Bonniec 1970, 173–74; Williams 1978, 264.

105. Feeney 1991, 300; Ahl 1974, 590.

106. Due 1962, 78.

107. Cf. Wheeler 2000, 151 on Ovid's sphragis as the denial of death. Furthermore, the poet's fame is immune to Jupiter's anger and fires (*Met.* 15.871).

108. Wheeler 2000, 140. In addition Feeney 1991, 297 has pointed out that Lucan's civil war is presented as a gigantomachy: "Yet it is a very odd sort of Gigantomachy, since the giant succeeds."

109. Moreover, Caesar does not fear storm's power (*BC* 5.578–84 and 654–56). His confidence places him in the center of the universe and makes the cosmos fade to mere decoration around him. Finally compared to Mars and Bellona (*BC* 7.568–70), Caesar performs his *aristeia* not by fighting but by his mere presence, which resembles a godly omnipresence. Cf. Glaesser 1984, 63–64 and n. 74.

110. *Fama*'s potential has been recognized by Zumwalt 1977. Hardie 1999 and also Hardie's forthcoming book on *Fama* pursue the topic further.

Having established the epic's concern with a *Fama* figure, I will examine how Lucan employs *Fama*/Rumor as a narratological device in the *Bellum Civile*. As I will argue, Lucan's *Bellum Civile* is an epic directed by Fame rather than Fate and it is in this way that Erictho's power as *Fama* figure spans the entire epic.[111]

Fama *Dispersed: Further Voices*

Above I have envisaged *Fama* as a narrative operator who helps to create the epic's fractured voice and simultaneously functions as a unifying device. In the same way Lucan's body imagery evokes the shared suffering of different bodies by making them one but also conjures up a world in pieces. In what follows I take a closer look at how Lucan employs *Fama* to spin a web of both fame and rumor through *Bellum Civile* 1. One way of doing so will be to examine some of the "further" and sometimes even "furthest voices" summoned by Lucan.

I have already pointed to the speech of the men of Ariminum (*BC* 1.244–61) as a prime example of the unheard made heard. Later on, Laelius, probably a fictional character named ironically for Scipio's sage friend and adviser, in *BC* 1.359–86 lends voice to what had only been described before as the undefined muttering of the masses: *dixerat;* ***at*** *dubium non claro murmure volgus / secum incerta fremit* (He [Caesar] ceased, but the wavering mass with inarticulate murmur mutters indistinctly, *BC* 1.352–53).[112] Laelius turns indistinct utterances of doubt into clear words. In addition he also functions as catalyst for Caesar's fame. He starts his speech by addressing Caesar as "greatest helmsman of the Roman name" (*Romani maxime rector / nominis*, *BC* 1.359–60). Moreover he swears to follow Caesar even through inhospitable Libya, whose fame has reached Laelius's ear long before it is told to the reader in *BC* 4. Caesar is here credited with the same potential as Cato, two great leaders whom their soldiers would follow anywhere.[113] Laelius then puts a strong emphasis on listening to and following just one voice, Caesar's.[114] He supports Caesar's authority with references to the general's deeds and glory and thus employs Caesar's

111. Still more so if one considers that in ancient manuscripts the script would not mark the distinction between personified *Fama* and unpersonified *fama*, as modern editions do.

112. Cf. Getty 1940 *ad BC* 1.357 and Duff's 1928 Loeb edition *ad locum* in a rare footnote. Note especially the stark contrast between Caesar's well-demarcated speech and the soldiers' response.

113. Wildberger 2005 points to a clever play on *sequi* (who follows whom) in the *Bellum Civile.*

114. Cf. *iussa sequi* (to carry out your [Caesar's] orders, *BC* 1.372), *audiero* (I hear [Caesar's trumpets], *BC* 1.374), *me iubeas* (if you [Caesar] order, *BC* 1.377), *iusseris* (you [Caesar] command, *BC* 1.385).

fame to the leader's advantage (*BC* 1.369–71 and *BC* 1.374–75). Subsequently Laelius merges back into the crowd, which shakes off its doubts by bursting into a universal and unifying shout of approval (*clamor*, *BC* 1.388). This confirms once more the effectiveness of Caesar's fame. His soldiers are willing to follow his voice; they are encouraged by his reputation (*BC* 1.386–88). The following simile with its Thessalian setting confirms that we have just set sail toward Pharsalus (*BC* 1.388–91).[115]

Then Caesar calls on his troops in order to march against the center of the world, Rome (*BC* 1.392–95). What follows is an astonishing catalog of both Gallic regions and peoples rejoicing when freed from Caesar's presence (*BC* 1.396–465). All these peoples have been soaked up by the Romans into their empire and have contributed to Caesar's *Fama.* At this occasion Lucan serves up a poignant piece of geopoetics, for these people are not unlike the river Isara (Isere), which loses its name when merging with a larger stream.[116] Now that these tribes have regained their independence, however, their own stories start to emerge again. Accordingly Lucan has packed the catalog with references to the regions' and peoples' histories. Each of them could be enlarged into a narrative or discourse. In some cases Lucan actually succumbs to this temptation, as in the passage on the play of ebb and flow (*BC* 1.409–19). Then again, other possibilities for excursus are implied but glossed over for the sake of the main narrative. The stories of the Nervii (*BC* 1.429) and the Ligures (*BC* 1.442–43) thus remain untold. How much of an independent *Fama* has sprung up in Gaul after Caesar and his troops retreat can be seen from the example of the bards (*BC* 1.447–49). Like the poet Lucan they, too, exert the power to eternalize with their songs: *vos quoque, qui fortes animas belloque peremptas / laudibus in longum vates dimittitis aevum* (you [bards] too, poets who with praise send forth into eternity the valiant spirits cut off in war, *BC* 1.447–48). The catalog ends with a second digression (*BC* 1.450–62), which introduces deliberations on knowledge and afterlife. In relativistic fashion Lucan states that the Druids either got it all right or all wrong: *solis nosse deos et caeli numina vobis / aut solis nescire datum* (to you alone is granted total knowledge of the gods and heaven's powers—or total ignorance, *BC* 1.452–53). With their doctrine Lucan allows an

115. Mt. Ossa is only ever mentioned again as part of Thessaly's warlike landscape in *BC* 6.348 and *BC* 6.412.

116. Cf. *hi vada liquerunt Isarae, qui [. . .] / . . . famae maioris in amnem / lapsus ad aequoreas nomen non pertulit undas* (Others left Isara's fords, a river that flows into a river of greater fame and does not convey its own name to the waters of the sea, *BC* 1.400–402). Hübner 1975, 203 demonstrates how the struggle for a name and fame is perpetuated and distorted in geography: unconventionally the tributary steals the name of the larger river (*BC* 4.24, Hiberus vs. Cinga). Moreover, Helle "steals" (*abstulit*) the name of the straits she fell into, which is thus never mentioned (*BC* 9.955–56), and imposes her own name. Cf. also Bartsch 1997, 155 n. 31 for a summary and a partial translation of Hübner.

alternative to his cosmos of *nefas* (sacrilege) to surface that states that death is not the end: *longae, canitis si cognita, vitae / mors media est* (If what you sing is known for fact, then death is the midpoint in prolonged life, *BC* 1.457–58). Suddenly this little excursus questions Lucan's literary project, questions the basis of the entire epic. If death is no evil, there is no *nefas* and thus no story. In what follows, however, Lucan takes control and dismisses the northern tribes—somewhat regretfully—as happy fools, thereby securing the continuation of his own story (*certe populi . . . felices errore suo* "without a doubt the people are fortunate in their mistake," *BC* 1.458–59).

Subsequently Lucan moves the focus of his epic back to Italy, where we witness the potency of Caesar's concentrated fame. All the key words are assembled in *BC* 1.469–72: empty rumor (*vana fama*), fear (*timores*), speed (*velox nuntia*), and fast action (*properantis belli*) come together with innumerable tongues (*innumeras linguas*) that spread false reports (*falsa preconia*). We see ever-growing *Fama* at work and gain insight into her mechanisms when we are offered an avalanche of anonymous rumors.[117] She also uses her (Ovidian) companions Fear and Terror to win strength: "so by his panic each gives strength to rumor, and they fear ungrounded evils of their own invention" (*sic quisque pavendo / dat vires famae, nulloque auctore malorum / quae finxere, timent*, *BC* 1.484–86). In this way *Fama* climbs up the social ladder and affects both commoners and senate (*BC* 1.486–88). By putting the senators to flight *Fama* manages to silence voices, which could speak up powerfully against her. The senators, however, hand over their voice to the consuls and join the mass exodus. Their behavior amplifies the horror *Fama* spreads even further. Finally Lucan's narration culminates in a simile providing the reader with a wider perspective. For it shows the "ship of state" in utter distress and near dissolution (*BC* 1.498–502). The list of prodigies (*BC* 1.522–83) that follows features a range of vocabulary exemplifying this state of insecurity.[118] The only certainty is that there is worse to come (*BC* 1.523–24). *Fama* triumphs when Rome is finally abandoned through the power of a single word: war (*tu tantum audito bellorum nomine, Roma, / desereris* "but, Rome, as soon as the word "war" is heard, you are deserted," *BC* 1.519–20).

What is more, Lucan also gives tales of past *nefas* (sacrilege) a chance to be

---

117. Cf. expressions such as "it is said" (*est qui*, *BC* 1.472, *adferat*, *BC* 1.475) and reported speech at *BC* 1.477–78 and 1.481–84.

118. Cf. *dubiae . . . salutis* (preservation so uncertain, *BC* 1.506), *non credita* (not trusted, *BC* 1.520), *ne qua . . . spes . . . trepidas mentes levet* (lest any hope might lift up their frightened minds, *BC* 1.522–23), *ignota . . . sidera* (stars unknown, *BC* 1.526 otherwise they could provide guidance), *caeloque inane* (heaven's empty space, *BC* 1.527–28), *fallaci . . . sereno* (deceptive cloudless sky, *BC* 1.530); it is a time of crisis and change: *mutantem regna cometen* (the comet, herald of a shift in power, *BC* 1.529), *varias . . . formas* (different shapes, *BC* 1.531). Cf. Lapidge 1979 for the Stoic landscape of cosmic dissolution.

heard. The tragic voices of Thyestes and of the brothers Eteocles and Polynices are employed in similes and thereby linked to present-day phenomena such as solar eclipses (*BC* 1.543–44) and the splitting of the flame at the *feriae Latinae* (*BC* 1.550–52). The two similes, both micro-images of civil war and brotherly strife, become virtually contemporary events. They join in seamlessly with the general cosmic and geographical disarray, presenting the reader with a frame of reference from the literary tradition.

Further rumors (*BC* 1.556–60) build up a crescendo of horrors, into which Lucan integrates every sound imaginable. Animals gain speech with ease (*BC* 1.561); *Fama* spreads the grim verses of the Sibyl of Cumae (*BC* 1.564–65); the priests of Bellona and Cybele, both dreaded goddesses, have their say, and even the dead join in (1.564–68). Moreover the forests contribute further voices to mix a spooky sound-track of war (*BC* 1.569–70). What is more, Lucan creates the impression of hell on earth by depicting a Fury laying siege to Rome, an image recalling Virgil's fury Allecto stirring up war in *Aeneid* 7.[119] Similes—again taken from tragedy—illustrate the Fury's maddening influence (*BC* 1.574–77). She spreads and obviously has spread the *furor* (madness) necessary for war. With *furor* provided, the crescendo culminates in the sounding of trumpets and the shouting of imaginary armies, completing the setting for war (*BC* 1.578–79). Last but not least, the great voices of the past, Sulla and Marius, raise their heads. They spread fear and prophesy disaster (*BC* 1.580–83). Here ends Lucan's catalog poem of ill-boding voices, which brims with verbs and nouns that denote utterance, sound, or forms of expression. All these Lucan weaves together into a continuous song of *nefas* (sacrilege). As no authoritative or authorial voice offers any interpretation or guidance amid the multitude of cameos, the reader is left alone with his worries and a desire for directions. This the three potential knowledge figures Lucan offers in the remaining verses *of BC* 1 definitively fail to satisfy.

For a start, the Arruns episode seems to restore some order within the chaos. First of all the priest Arruns takes control.[120] As a result the citizen body marches together with the city's priesthood in a formation whose orderly arrangement Lucan depicts in detail (*BC* 1.592–604).[121] In spite of that, the sacrifice so carefully prepared goes horribly wrong in the end. Arruns seeks refuge

119. Cf. *ingens urbem cingebat Erinys* (a huge Erinys was circling Rome, *BC* 1.572). Rome, the *urbs*, is virtually framed by *ingens* and *Erinys.* Cf. Hardie 1993, 59 for the hell on earth topos in Latin epic.

120. Cf. *iubet* (he orders, *BC* 1.589 and 1.592). Cf. Rambaud 1985 and 1988 on the religious and historical background of Arruns's practices.

121. On the literary motif of order in chaos cf. Hömke 1998. Cf. also Erictho's detailed and orderly preparations in *BC* 6 and Sen. *Thy.* 691–95 for Atreus's minute groundwork before the sacrifice of Thyestes' boys.

in ambiguity and silence (*non fanda timemus* "unutterable are the things we fear," *BC* 1.634; *multaque tegens ambage canebat* "he veiled the omens in obscure ambiguity," *BC* 1.638). He even prays that his insights may prove false (*BC* 1.636–37). Ultimately the sacrificial body constitutes the only message communicated to the reader; all information we gain is embodied in its disorderly features (*BC* 1.627–29).

In a similar manner the astrologer Nigidius Figulus emphatically raises more questions than answers.[122] He describes a disordered cosmos that mirrors the dark forebodings of war on earth and foreshadows the ousting of Roman values, both moral and political (*BC* 1.642–72).[123] On a smaller scale the body of the raging matron filled with Apollo's words offers us a micro-narrative of the civil war in sixteen lines (*BC* 1.678–94). For a brief moment she embodies the entire epic, becomes a symbol of Rome's fall (*iacuit* "she collapsed," *BC* 1.695). The matron offers us a narrative skeleton, a very short introduction to civil war, an epitaph on Rome. In what follows the reader will be overwhelmed by the multitude of voices Lucan employs to put flesh on this skeleton and to construct his epic body. The reader turns away from *BC* 1 prepared to be constantly left in the dark and uncertain whom to listen to.[124]

As emerged from my analysis above, it is *Fama*, both rumor and much-desired fame, who directs and influences the epic's course to a great extent. Accordingly she is both scribe of and inscribed into the epic. Fama is both the epic's driving force and simultaneously what author and protagonists achieve with the help of the epic. In view of the preeminence of *Fama* throughout, already exemplified in *BC* 1, the reader will wonder even more about Lucan's attempt to glorify Nero at the very beginning of the epic (*BC* 1.33–66).[125] Paulsen concludes in his discussion of the Nero encomium: "Lucan thus had to isolate the encomium as far as possible so that it would fit seamlessly into the epic structure but would stand on its own in regard to content."[126] In his opinion this is achieved through recantation ("Palinodie") of Nero's praise in later parts of Lucan's opus. My examination, however, suggests a further indication that Nero's praise has been isolated. It is excluded from the web of *Fama* with which Lucan knots his epic corpus together from *BC* 1.130 onward. Nero is left out; his

122. Narducci 1974, 99–100 sees in Nigidius Figulus's prophecy the inversion of Venus's supplication for an end to Aeneas's labors. Cf. *Aen.* 1.241 and *BC* 1.669.

123. Lewis 1998 argues that the stars described by Numanus correspond to the appearance of the sky at the time of Nero's ascendance to the throne. For others the stars are simply foreboding images of the war to come. Cf. Luisi 1993 and Hannah 1996.

124. Masters 1992 offers a discourse on (failing) knowledge figures.

125. This encomium has originated much scholarly dispute. Cf. Grimal 1960, Arnaud 1987, Hunink 1993, Dewar 1994, and Holmes 1999.

126. Paulsen 1995, 198 (my translation).

fame is not carried on by the epos, as he does not find his way into the *Fama* the epic constructs. Instead the poet Lucan studiously connects his own *Fama* with that of his oeuvre.

Let me reinforce my argument for the preeminence of *Fama* with a final observation. It is an axiom of Lucan's choice of subject matter that military glory is not to be won in civil war. At best glory can be annihilated, as we learn from Pompey's perception of the battle of Pharsalus: *Pompei nec crimen erit nec gloria bellum* (the battle shall be neither the reproach nor the glory of Pompey, *BC* 7.112). In Virgil's *Aeneid*, however, *gloria* (glory) is employed much as *Fama* is in Lucan, in that it serves as final achievement of the epic quest. Aeneas is to establish the future glory of Rome, as showcased by Anchises in the parade of future heroes: *Nunc age, Dardaniam prolem quae deinde sequatur /* ***gloria*** . . . */ expediam dictis et te tua fata docebo* (Now then, the glory henceforth to attend the Trojan race I shall reveal in speech and inform you of your destiny, *Aen.* 6.756–59). It is indeed part of Virgil's project to link the past glory of Troy (*ingens /* ***gloria*** *Teucrorum* "the great glory of the Teucrians," *Aen.* 2.325) with the future glory of Rome. We find this concept exemplified in a nutshell in the epitaph on Caieta (*Aen.* 7.1–4) at the beginning of *Aeneid* 7, which serves as bridge between the Trojan first half and the Italian/Roman second half of the *Aeneid*. in these verses, however, in sharp contrast to Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, *gloria* and *fama* still go hand in hand. What is more, *gloria* (predominantly that of future generations) is employed as a motivating force when urging Aeneas to keep on the right path toward Rome and leave Dido behind (*Aen.* 4.232 and *Aen.* 4.272). In contrast, in Lucan's epic *gloria* appears stripped of any ideological significance.[127] Already at its very first appearance it is made clear that in this epic glory is nothing to rejoice in. For Caesar can find no joy in having driven Pompey out of Italy—alive and without combat (*non illum* ***gloria*** *pulsi / laetificat Magni* "the glory of Magnus's rout does not delight," *BC* 3.48). Indeed it seems that the only way in which human glory can be won in the *Bellum Civile* is through death or ancestry. Accordingly the Brahmins are praised for taking their fate into their own hands and winning glory through suicide (*BC* 3.241–42). Vulteius's suicide strikes the same note (*BC* 4.479–80); and the conceit that the only glory that can be promised to Sextus Pompeius is that of a short life fits the pattern (*BC* 6.805–6). Ancestry, fame won in the past but not the dire present, can be traced in the appearances of the Massilian twin brothers, dubbed as "the glory of a fruitful mother" (*fecundae* ***gloria*** *matris*,

127. The line *ambitiosa fames et lautae gloria mensae* (ostentatious hunger and pride in a lavish table, *BC* 4.376) may well serve as an indication of what has become of the Virgilian *gloria* won through virtue. Cf. OLD *gloria* 3 (glorious deed) vs. 4 (boast).

BC 3.603), and of Antaeus, "his mother's pride" (*nec fuit genetricis* ***gloria,*** *BC* 4.595). Similarly the glory Pompey bestows on Cornelia after he has lost his good cause also looks back to an earlier reputation: *nunc sum tibi* ***gloria*** *maior* (now I bring you greater glory, *BC* 8.78). Moreover, as part of Lucan's epic technique, which mirrors the turmoil of the Roman Republic on many levels, we find that geography, too, has its share in the discourse on *gloria.* The Black Sea steals glory from the Pillars of Hercules (*BC* 3.277–79), thus imitating the epic's central conflict for fame, and Mytilene wins glory by protecting Cornelia (*BC* 8.110–11). In the end we find that conventional glory is reserved for those who would control the Nile (*BC* 10.284–5), for foreigners (Juba *BC* 4.715–17), and, significantly, for those who could play a part in Caesar's death (Pothinus and Achillas: *BC* 10.377–78).[128]

In accordance with these observations it comes as no surprise to us that *decus* (honor), too, experiences a redefinition in the course of the epic. Already at the word's first appearance the standards for *decus* are redefined: *magnumque* ***decus*** *ferroque petendum / plus patria potuisse sua, mensuraque iuris / vis erat* (it was an honor great and to be sought by the sword, to have more power than the state; the yardstick of legality was violence, *BC* 1.174–76). While this term can be justly employed in connection with the glittering name of Brutus (*o* ***decus*** *imperii . . .* "o glory of the state," *BC* 7.588.), Lucan also dubs Erictho *decus Haemonidum*, grace of Thessaly (*BC* 6.590). In a similar manner the *decus* of Massilia is deconstructed when *decus* is also used to describe the glorious victory of the Caesarian side.[129] Accordingly when *decus* is applied to Pompey in the hour of his death the reader is already well aware of the ambiguity Lucan has built up around this concept: *at, Magni cum terga sonent et pectora ferro, / permansisse* ***decus*** *sacrae venerabile formae* (But, as the weapons sound on Magnus's back and breast, the majestic beauty of his sacred features lasted, *BC* 8.663–64).[130] By then Lucan's writing will have systematically undermined the conventional Roman system of values, displacing it in his epic of Fame—not Fate—in favor of an omnipresent and omnipotent *Fama.*

---

128. Caesar seems fully aware of the glory his death would bestow on his killer (*BC* 5.656–57). Marti 1970 argues for the murder of Caesar as a likely end to the epic.

129. Cf. *iam satis hoc Graiae memorandum contigit urbi / aeternumque* ***decus*** (Now the Greek city gained eternal glory, well deserving mention, *BC* 3.388–89) and *at Brutus in aequore victor / primus Caesareis pelagi* ***decus*** *addidit armis* (But Brutus was victorious on the water and first conferred on Caesar's warfare glory at sea, *BC* 3.761–62).

130. Wick 2004 points to a further instance where *decus* is clouded in ambivalence. Scorpio wins *decus* by killing Orion in *BC* 9.836. Lucan, however, remains silent about which version of this myth he refers to. Orion is often seen as having been justly punished for transgressions toward Artemis, but Lucan here stages his death as a heroic fight.

Fama Preserved: Epitaphic Gestures

Lucan's *Bellum Civile* is an epic obsessed with death and burial. Not only is *mors* (death) a constant presence and described in great detail, but also the closure (or lack thereof) that burial provides is a constant theme that runs through the narrative.[131] Accordingly frequent signposts direct the reader toward Pompey's untimely end. At the same time, as will be exemplified by my discussion of Vulteius and his men in chapter 4, in accordance with the prominence given to *Fama* throughout, many figures in the text display less concern with their actual death than interest in their *Nachleben.* Indeed, gaining *Nachleben* often emerges as the sole motivation of their actions. Furthermore, Lucan himself frequently offers us an *epiphonema* on one of his poem's personae, in which he weighs up a life in just a handful of verses. Sometimes these comments shed an unexpectedly positive light on the characters that are fading out of the epic plot.

The first of these *epiphonemata* is Lucan's epitaph on Marius that confines itself to remembering the latter's changing fortune and captures the figure of a leader who despite ups and downs exits on a high when consul for the seventh time.

> *septimus haec sequitur repetitis fascibus annus.*
> *ille fuit vitae Mario modus omnia passo,*
> *quae peior fortuna potest, atque omnibus uso,*
> *quae melior, mensoque hominis quid fata paterent*
>
> [After this the seventh year restored the Rods of office. That for Marius was life's end: all of worse Fortune's works he had suffered, all of better Fortune's works enjoyed, and measured the extremes of human destiny.] (*BC* 2.130–33)

His most memorable features are not as one would expect given the many cruelties he committed—for those will be outshone by the civil war that impends.[132] Instead Lucan chooses to integrate Marius into the recurrent motif of the reversibility of fortune and toppling from height—in this rare case with resurgence to power.[133] Marius will stand as example of what Pompey could

131. Braund 1992, xlii–xliv provides a concise overview.

132. Pomeroy 1991, 258 suggests that while biography "attempts to be comprehensive in its records of an individual's life," death notices seek "to isolate the most memorable or instructive features."

133. On the reversibility of Fortune cf. Marius and Carthage *BC* 2.91–93; cf. also Caesar as top-

have turned into had he reached old age. The tyrant who lives too long for his own reputation certainly serves as paradigm—one of many as we shall see—in Lucan's discourse on how to end a life.

Soon Marcia, Cato's former wife and now wife to be (again), appears on the epic stage with the sole mission of securing her lasting reputation as manifested in her tombstone inscription.

> *da tantum nomen inane*
> *conubii; liceat tumulo scripsisse "Catonis*
> *Marcia" nec dubium longo quaeratur in aevo*
> *mutarim primas expulsa an tradita taedas*
>
> [Grant me only the empty name of spouse and let my tomb read, "Marcia, wife of Cato," and let there be no dispute in the future whether by divorce or by transferal I changed my first marriage.] (*BC* 2.342–45)

As a result she casts an epitaphic shadow from the very beginning over her renewed union with Cato. Their alliance's lack of physicality emphasizes that its purpose is to honor Marcia.[134] All she asks for is to be the female shadow of a great name.

Similarly the Massilian twin brothers form an epitaphic unit: while one of the pair is killed in the sea battle, the other survives as living remembrance of his brother: *tenet ille dolorem / semper et amissum fratrem lugentibus offert* (he maintains their anguish for always and presents his lost brother to them as they mourn, *BC* 3.607–8).

One of the most ambiguous and therefore most discussed figures in Lucan's epic is the young Curio. He meets his premature end by his own hand after his Caesarian troops have been wiped out by Juba.[135] Curio has been counted among the members of a lost generation—lost when the political climate of the age left no room for the virtues of old.[136] Moreover, Curio features prominently in Caesar's *commentarii*, a result of the combination of Caesar's personal sympathies and the promptings of propaganda before the African campaign.[137]

---

pling statue when his soldiers attempt mutiny (*BC* 5.249–51) and Lucan's comments on Pompey after the battle of Pharsalus (*BC* 8.27–32).

134. On Stoic traces in the character of Marcia cf. Harich 1990.

135. This episode has attracted much scholarly attention cf. Mutschler 1975, Ahl 1976, 84–115, Berthold 1977, Esposito 2000, La Penna 2000a, and La Penna 2000b.

136. On the historical Curio cf. Dettenhofer 1992, 33–62 and 146–55.

137. Cf. Dettenhofer 1992, 151 and *Civ.* 2.23–44, an episode dubbed the "*Heldenepos Curio*."

Lucan was thus confronted with a detailed and diverse tradition on a historical figure; at any rate the image he draws of Curio's character is nothing if not ambiguous. On the one hand he sees no real virtue in Curio's death *ceciditque in strage suorum / impiger ad letum et fortis virtute coacta* (he fell amid the wreckage of his own men, vigorous for death and brave with necessary valor, *BC* 4.797–98).[138] On the other Lucan considers him deserving of commemoration and praises his merits.

> *at tibi nos, quando non proderit ista silere*
> *a quibus omne aevi senium sua fama repellit,*
> *digna damus, iuvenis, meritae praeconia vitae*
> *haud alium tanta civem tulit indole Roma*
> *aut cui plus leges deberent recta sequenti*
>
> [But it is no use to keep quiet about deeds whose own fame fends off all decay of time—so to you, young man, we give worthy commendation to the life that earned it. No other citizen of such great talent did Rome produce, to no other did the laws owe more had he followed what was right.] (*BC* 4.811–15)[139]

Like Vulteius and Scaeva Curio functions as a stand-in for Caesar; but at the same time, the lack of a tomb for his body prefigures Pompey's fate.[140] What we learn about the character of Curio in both his speeches, two bravura pieces clad with *sententiae*, is that he represents not so much a "disintegration of Roman *virtus*" as a rhetoricization of it, as is exemplified by his two speeches in *BC* 1.273–91 and *BC* 4.702–10.[141] Curio is characterized as a voice, the voice of the Roman people, once eager to prevent civil war: *[. . .] audax venali comitatur Curio lingua, **vox** quondam populi libertatemque tueri / ausus et armatos plebi miscere potentes* (with them came the reckless Curio with his mercenary tongue—once the people's voice, he dared to champion liberty, to level with the people armed grandees, *BC* 1.269–71).[142] That he is then repeatedly depicted disputing in favor of war marks him as a product of rhetorical education; he stands out as a master of the word, able to argue pro and contra on the same issue, as and when the situation demands. Accordingly, his death, the death of

138. Cf. Sklenar 2003, 43.

139. Cf. Pomeroy 1991, 187–89 on possible historiographical models for Lucan's obituaries of Domitius, Pompey, and Curio. La Penna 2000b, 232–33 notes the epitaphic gesture inherent in the questions of *BC* 4.799–804 (cf. Virg. *Georg.* 3.525–26).

140. "La mancanza di tomba accomuna Curione a Pompeo" (Esposito 2000, 51 n. 25 on 4.809–10).

141. Cf. also Thompson and Bruère 1970, 172.

142. Cf. Getty and Martindale 1992 *ad loc.*

the voice that once fought for freedom, indicates another step toward the perversion and loss of Roman liberty. Curio's change of faith foreshadows Lucan's lament a few hundred verses later, and spells out what rhetoricization can mean for the integrity of a character: *namque omnis voces per quas iam tempore tanto / mentimur dominos haec primum repperit aetas* (and indeed all those expressions with which for so long now we have lied to our masters were invented by that age, *BC* 5.385–86). Gowing defines this passage as Lucan's "moment at which the Republic died and the empire began to take shape."[143] Lucan's emphatic and unforgettable *epiphonema* on Curio points us to the discourse on freedom and freedom of speech he embodies.[144] The marked ambivalence of this figure is enhanced by Lucan's final dictum: "they all bought, but he sold Rome" (*emere omnes, hic vendidit urbem*, *BC* 4.824). This line links Curio to a verse from Virgil's underworld describing the doomed, which was in all likelihood originally coined for Mark Antony.[145] The scholia on Lucan, however, already read the Virgilian verse as referring to Curio and thus as directly prefiguring Lucan's *epimythion*.[146] Ever the more, then, for the reader Curio remains a tragic and sinister figure, a *grande dannato* aligned with the great and bad of Roman history.[147]

Caesar, even though seemingly invulnerable and soon to be immortal, is not above deliberating on his own tombstone inscription, which would list all his offices and honours (*nulla meis aberit titulis Romana potestas* "no Roman office will my inscription lack," *BC* 5.664). In fact he virtually delivers his own funeral speech when caught in the storm *of Bellum Civile* 5, where he enumerates his *res gestae*.

> *Arctoas domui gentes, inimica subegi*
> *arma metu, vidit Magnum mihi Roma secundum,*
> *iussa plebe tuli fasces per bella negatos*
>
> [I have tamed the northern peoples, by fear subdued hostile soldiers; Rome has seen Magnus second to me; by ordering the people I have won the Rods denied to me by warfare.] (*BC* 5.661–63)

The parallel and asyndetic first two cola may even evoke the style of the *elogium*, a form of archaic honorary inscription and hallowed republican institu-

143. Cf. Gowing 2005, 93 n. 58.

144. Henderson 1998a, 200 sees the *curi-a* fall with *Curi-o*.

145. Cf. *vendidit hic auro patriam dominumque potentem / imposuit* (This one sold his country for gold, and fastened on her a tyrant lord, *Aen.* 6.621–22). Cf. Norden 1917 *ad loc.*

146. Cf. Esposito 2000, 52.

147. Esposito 2000, 54.

tion, with which the Romans used to commemorate their worthiest men.[148] Caesar's republican *elogium* would have been the last of its kind, as a change of government lies but a few steps ahead: this is the last possible moment in which Caesar could die still an ordinary man (*BC* 5.665–68). Pointedly, Caesar goes on to end his self-commemoration with the statement that he—unlike everybody else—cares nothing for funeral rites and burial

> *mihi funere nullo*
> *est opus, o superi, lacerum retinete cadaver*
> *fluctibus in mediis desint mihi busta rogusque*
> *dum metuar semper*
>
> [No need have I of burial, O gods; keep my mangled corpse in the billows' midst, let me be without tomb and pyre, provided that I am always feared.] (*BC* 5.668–71)

Caesar does not mind suffering the fate that awaits Pompey, to be a mangled corpse drifting in the sea, as long as his name lives on to be feared. He thus characterizes himself as a tyrant through an actualization of the *oderint dum metuant* (Let them hate me as long as they fear me) formula coined (for tyrants) by Accius.[149] Finally, having no fixed tomb would invest Caesar (and will later invest Pompey) with an almost supernatural omnipresence. Mindful that at the time of Lucan's writing Caesar was a secure fixture among the gods, we find his divine position foreshadowed by Caesar's display of self-consciousness toward *Fortuna*, the gods and the elements, and the demonstrative rejection of natural closure through death and funeral—Caesar already counts on apotheosis.[150]

Finally an all too short but most compelling inscription graces Pompey's tomb: *HIC SITUS EST MAGNUS* (Here lies Magnus, *BC* 8.793). Not unlike Phaethon, Pompey crashes in failure, having dared great things, and Ovid's epitaph on Phaethon must indeed be Lucan's prompt.[151] The purpose of this surprisingly plain inscription and "the point of this studiously simple epitaph is

148. Fraenkel 1964, 141 points out echoes of *elogia* in Dido's speeches in *Aeneid* 4.

149. Cf. Tarrant 1985, 42 for Seneca's reception of Accius's ubiquitous line.

150. Caesar's godlike behavior constitutes one of the paradoxes exploited by Lucan's *sententiae.* Cf. *sed expensa superorum et Caesaris ira* (weighing in the scales the wrath of gods and Caesar, *BC* 3.439); *Italiam si caelo auctore recusas / me pete* (if you refuse Italy at heaven's command, seek it at mine, *BC* 5.579–80); *et veniam meruere dei* (and the gods earn forgiveness—from Caesar, *BC* 4.123); *dum se desse deis ac non sibi numina credit* (in the belief that he was failing the gods and not the deities him, *BC* 5.499); *bella pares superis facient civilia divos* (the civil wars will create divinities equal to those above, *BC* 7.457).

151. Cf. HIC SITVS EST PHAETHON CVRRVS AVRIGA PATERNI / QVEM SI NON TENVIT MAGNIS TAMEN EXCIDIT AVSIS (Here Phaethon lies: in Phoebus' car he fared, and though he greatly failed, more greatly dared, Ov. *Met.* 2.327–28).

that true greatness needs but the bare name for complete identification."[152] But that is not all; by keeping the inscription to a minimum Lucan allows Pompey's tomb to be an ambivalent sign: "At one moment Pompey's tomb is a disgrace, at the next a glory; now an object of pilgrimage, now lost to sight."[153] Indeed looking back over Lucan's discourse on death we find a series of ambivalences: savage Marius dies in old age in his bed; the Massilian twin is honorably cut to pieces in battle and survives unscathed in his spitting image; Curio dies dishonored in battle and yet is praised; Caesar ought to die but does not, and the same is true for his alter ego, Scaeva. In Lucan's epic world death as a closural device rarely offers a simple solution. Finally, Lucan himself—following Ovid's example at the end of the *Metamorphoses*—commandeers his epic for his epitaph. Not only is he writing himself into his poem, becoming (as we have seen) a frequent voice through his numerous apostrophes, but he also seeks embodiment in several poet figures, and clamors for his epic to preserve his fame: *venturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra / vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo* (Our Pharsalia shall live, and we shall be condemned to darkness by no era, *BC* 9.985–86).[154] To reinforce this internal epitaphic gesture, Lucan's biography, too, compels the reader to perceive his epic as his legacy; and of course this equation has become irresistible now that the misfortunes of textual tradition have robbed us of all of his other works, beyond a few shreds. Whatever one's view of the end of the *Bellum Civile*—be it design or chance—as it stands it seduces us all too easily into imagining how young Lucan's genius was broken by a cruel emperor. Whether dictated on Lucan's deathbed, hastily composed the night before his death, or purposefully written long before that, it fuels the myth of Lucan. In light of the biographical tradition we cannot help but sense the *Bellum Civile* as both the culmination and the end of Lucan's literary career. Fate did not allow him to pursue a literary career step-by-step, following the Virgilian model.[155] In an age when the republican *cursus honorum* with its age regulations had become an empty form, Lucan's literary career, too, mirrors the uprooting of this concept. Unlike Virgil, who progresses slowly up the ladder of genres, Lucan took them all at once, crammed into the span of just a few years of adulthood cut short by premature death. Statius's account and praise of Lucan's *iuvenialia* sets up the comparison for us.[156] We can but wonder what literary deeds Lucan might have progressed to, had he lived. However, as a me-

---

152. Mayer 1981 *ad loc.*

153. Mayer 1981, 185.

154. Cf. d'Alessandro-Behr 2007 on Lucan's apostrophes and Masters 1992 on poet figures in Lucan's epic.

155. On the Virgilian literary career and the Roman *cursus honorum* cf. Cheney 2002 and Hardie and Moore 2010.

156. Cf. Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.54–74 and Malamud 1995.

dieval epitaph attests, Lucan's legacy is not only measured in the number of books that survive but is also defined by his stylistic contribution, his pointed formulations and their echoes.

EPITAPHIUM LUCANI

Corduba ***me genuit; rapuit*** *Nero; proelia dixi*
quae gessere pares hinc socer inde gener.
Continuo numquam derexi carmina ductu
Quae tractim serpant, plus mihi comma placet.
Fulminis in morem quae sint miranda citentur:
Haec vere rapiet dictio, quae feriet.[157]

Corduba bore me, Nero took my life; I sang of the battles
Fought by the matched pair, father-in-law and son-in-law.
I have never written the verses in continuous flow
to creep along draggingly: I prefer the short phrase.
Let things to excite wonder be told like a thunderbolt:
This verse will capture, that strikes.
(Trans. J. A. Crook)

Mindful of the Virgilian tradition, Lucan acknowledges his life in the first line with the same words used in Virgil's epitaph.

Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc
Parthenope; cecini pascua rura duces.

[Mantua bore me, in Calabria I died, now I lie at Parthenope; / My poems were of meadows, fields, and chieftains.] (Trans. J. A. Crook)

But for Lucan the author pointedly fills in Nero as cause of death and the civil war as subject matter. The rest of the poem, however, is more concerned with Lucanian style than content. What has left an impression and lives on is Lucan's preference for the short and striking. According to this reading, Lucan's many *sententiae* are a characteristic feature of his oeuvre and nurture his fame. This leads me to examine Lucan's *sententiae* as a further characteristic trait of Lucan's epic technique in the following chapter.

157. Cf. Baehrens 1883, vol. 5, 74; *Anth. Latina*, Riese 1906, 668.

CHAPTER 3

Autarchic Limbs

Sententiae in Lucan

We saw in the preceding chapters how Lucan employs both corporeal imagery and language as well as abstract concepts such as *Fama* as part of his epic technique to bind together the body of his text. This chapter will focus on a further facet of Lucan's writing style, this time on the level of syntax rather than metaphor. I shall examine how one particular characteristic of Lucan's rhetoric, his *sententiae*, constitute a compositional feature that contributes to the thematic unity of his often seemingly fragmented epic.

Studies of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* have firmly established the label "rhetorical epic."[1] This slogan flags the notion of verbal virtuosity, while warning of the dangers of vain declamation and lack of substance. However, attempts to rescue Lucan from the clutches of those who stick with Quintilian's often repeated statement that this author has rhetoric to offer other than poetry have led the way in rehabilitating some of Lucan's artful rhetorical devices.[2] What has frequently been ignored is that Quintilian's judgment—which if one reads it as part of a rhetorical treatise must be considered more compliment than rebuke—starts off on an even more positive note: "Lucan is ardent, passionate and particularly distinguished for his *sententiae.*"[3] This feature is confirmed by Morford's *apologia*, which concludes: "And it is true that the excellence of

1. As eternalized in the subtitle of Morford 1967.

2. *magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus* (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90). Cf. further Morford 1967, 85–88. Nadaï 2000 analyzes Lucan from a rhetorical perspective.

3. *Lucanus ardens et concitatus et* ***sententiis clarissimus*** (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90). Cf. Russell 2001 *ad loc.*

Lucan lies in his *sententiae*."[4] By Lucan's day, however, the term *sententia* had developed from its first-century BC meaning, "precept," "maxim," or "generally accepted commonplace." Already in the writings of Lucan's grandfather Seneca the Elder it designates the format of both gnomic generalizations and penetrating epigrams.[5] The function of *gnomai*, when defined as generalizing statements about particular human actions or the gods, is akin to that of modern-day proverbs.[6] They "persuade the listener and move him to correct action by utterance of familiar, unassailable wisdom."[7] It comes as no surprise, then, that the contents of *gnomai* cover all of human experience, as can be seen from an edition of Menander's *gnomai* that is not ordered alphabetically as in the manuscript tradition but instead grouped by themes such as "virtue," "wedlock," "old age," "women," "death," "happiness," and "modesty."[8] The same applies to the collection of alphabetically ordered *sententiae* from the mimes of Publilius Syrus, in which the reader can also make out recurrent topoi.[9] Indeed, some of Publilius's *sententiae* provide variation on the same theme. Below I provide a small selection focusing on avarice:

A14 *avarus ipse miseriae causa est suae* (The mean man is the cause of his own misery).
A21 *avarum facile capias, ubi non sis item* (You want to catch a mean man? Just be generous!)
A23 *Avarus nisi cum moritur, nihil recte facit* (The mean man only does well when he dies).
A25 *Avarus damno potius quam sapiens dolet* (Loss hurts the mean more than the wise).
A26 *Avaro quid mali optes nisi: vivat diu?* (You want to curse a mean man? Say: Long may you live!)
A35 *Avidum oportet esse neminem, minime senem* (No one ought to be mean, especially not the old).
A46 *Avaro acerba poena natura est sua* (cf. A14).
A47 *Avaro non est vita, sed mors longior* (The mean man does not live, but rather dies slowly).

4. Morford 1967, 85, citing Dr. Johnson's judgment of Lucan's "pointed sentences, comprised in vigorous and animated lines" in support.

5. Sinclair 1995, 120–22 outlines the history of the term *sententia*.

6. Boeke 2007, 13.

7. Russo 1997, 57.

8. Cf. Jäkel 1986, 116.

9. Cf. n. 44.

The gnomic form of the *sententia* subsequently retreats more and more in favor of rhetorical pointed expressions that are thought up to fit a particular context and thus do not display universal gnomic force.[10] From the selection of Publilius above we may take A14 and A46, which both express the same thought in a different wording, as precursors of the rhetorical practice to create incidental or casual redefinitions of current values rather than complete gnomic statements. This prevailing rhetorical type of *sententia* coined in accordance with the needs of each specific occasion employs a large variety of stylistic features. These are, in the order Quintilian discusses them, surprise, allusion, transfer from one context into another, repetition, and finally contrast of opposites as well as comparison.[11] In his discussion, which culminates in body imagery, Quintilian demonstrates how *sententiae* are incorporated and firmly attached to the body of the text. He construes *sententiae* as the most beautiful parts of the textual body and compares them to eyes: "Personally I think these highlights are in a sense the eyes of eloquence."[12] Quintilian also presents the notion that *sententiae* are extracts from an author's mind and can even convey something of the author himself, according to an etymology he provides.[13] Consequently *sententiae* not only stick out and attract the attention of the reader through their rhetorical beauty but might also provide access to the voice of the author in the text. This is not to imply that I will be retreating to naive biographism in search of the author as moralist when relating *sententiae* to thoughts of the author. Rather I would like to emphasize that whatever skeptical view we might take as modern literary critics on this matter, it is a perspective that derives from ancient literary criticism itself and thus represents a point of view, indeed an interpretative convention, with which the ancient audience might have been expected to be familiar.

---

10. Cf. Sussman 1978, 36 and Kirchner 2001, 38–39. The latter confines himself to examining gnomic *sententiae*; cf. Kirchner 2001, 44–48.

11. Cf. *ex inopinato* (Quint. *Inst.* 8.5.15); *sunt et alio relata* (8.5.16); *et aliunde petita, id est in alium locum ex alio tralata* (8.5.17); *geminatio* (8.5.17); *ex contrariis* (8.5.18); *cum aliqua comparatione clarescit* (8.5.19).

12. Cf. *ego vero haec lumina orationis velut oculos quosdam esse eloquentiae credo* (Quint. *Inst.* 8.5.34). On the beauty of the eyes cf. Russell 2001 *ad loc.* In the following sentence Quintilian carries this textual body imagery even further when arguing against an excess of *sententiae*: *Sed neque oculos esse toto corpore velim, ne cetera membra officium suum perdant* (But I don't want there to be eyes all over the body, lest the other organs lose their function).

13. Cf. *sententiam veteres quod animo sensissent vocaverant. id cum est apud oratores frequentissimum, tum etiam in usu cotidiano quasdam reliquias habet* (The ancients used the word *sententia* to mean what they felt in their minds. This meaning is very common in the orators, and there are some vestiges of it in everyday usage, Quint. *Inst.* 8.5.1). Already Anaximenes *Ars Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 11.1 defines *gnomai* as expressions of an author's opinion. Cf. also Carey 1995, 96–99 on the highly personalized poetic voice of Pindar, which finds its expression in pronouncing *gnomai* as first-person statements—not unlike personal thoughts.

As we will see, Lucan has fully absorbed both the gnomic and the rhetorical form of *sententiae* into his epic, a feature much noted but little discussed.[14] This results in a high frequency of paradox and hyperbole, figures that are fundamental to Lucan's rhetorical style.[15] This chapter will pursue this connection between style and content even further by examining what the label "rhetorical" in point of fact means. I will move away from talking about rhetorical epic in a generalizing fashion and ask how rhetoric pinned down to detailed verbal points functions when producing the world of this epic and the body of this text. I will do so by looking at one specific rhetorical device, Lucan's *sententiae*, which appear throughout the epic in all shapes and sizes as an essential part of Lucan's epic technique and help to connect the many episodes if his epic. In what follows, I examine how Lucan's *sententiae* serve as carriers of his rhetoric and make themselves indispensable for inverting clichés and creating discourse across the entire epic.[16] As we shall see, twisted and perverted proverbs play an important role in Lucan's distorted cosmos, and subsequently also leave their mark on the reception of Lucan. I propose reading Lucan's *sententiae* as the epic's readers' digest, the best of *BC*, essential Lucan—and, most particularly, as Lucan's legacy to his text.

Readers of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* experience an epic in which the authorial voice trumpets louder and more frequently than in any previous epic.[17] Lucan becomes a constant presence by writing himself into his text. As a result of his campaign of self-memorialization, the *Bellum Civile* incorporates Lucan. In addition, with his *sententiae* Lucan also creates limbs of his epic body that writers on the hunt for pointed formulation can easily appropriate and incorporate into new textual bodies.

At the rhetoricians' schools of imperial Rome "the poets were studied not only for examples of rhetorical techniques but especially for examples of epigram (*sententiae*)."[18] For at the beginning of the standard rhetorical training stood exercises, "in which the students worked up an anecdote climaxing in a

14. Heitland lxv–lxvii in Haskins 1887 lists a sample of Lucan's *sententiae*. Tucker 1967, appendix 8 provides a more substantial collection.

15. Cf. Hübner 1972, Hübner 1975, Martindale 1976.

16. Rolim de Moura 2008 and 2010 suggests that the voices that deliver discourse/speeches in Lucan's epic are making statements that respond to one another in a debate that spreads across the epic.

17. Braund 1992, xlix counts 144 instances of apostrophe. On the impact of this frequent and loud voice of the author on the reader cf. Bartsch 1997, 94–98. Cf. also Burck 1958, 140 ("In keinem der (römischen) Epen erfolgt die Deutung des historischen Geschehens so drängend unmittelbar, gelegentlich sogar so aufdringlich durch den Dichter wie in der Pharsalia") as well as D'Alessandro Behr 2007 and Asso 2008, who develop their argument from an analysis of Lucan's apostrophes.

18. Keith 2000, 17. On the poetic afterlife of single, often fragmented lines of Virgil in patchwork texts, so-called *centos*, cf. McGill 2005.

pithy saying, elaborated a proverb or apophthegm, and composed a fable and a simple narrative."[19] Epigrams from epic thus functioned as "cultural capital," eagerly excerpted by the studious reader.[20] Lucan's epic could be used as a gold mine for *sententiae.* This characteristic of the text secures Lucan's afterlife in pieces—through excerptability, which allows for the reuse of his *sententiae* in new textual bodies.[21] The *Controversiae* of Seneca the Elder show that passing on rhetorical pearls from one generation of orators to the next and to future generations is high on the agenda.[22]

Seneca has turned to this subject at the request of his sons and offers them rhetorical specimens for examination and imitation (Sen. 1 *Con.* pr.1.6). Like so much else in Roman elite culture, *sententiae* run in families. So "close parallels between turns of phrase in the younger Seneca's works and *sententiae* recorded in his father's anthology" abound.[23] It can come as no surprise then that Lucan, too, shared in this family tradition.[24]

For Seneca the Elder *sententiae* can even serve as the sole criterion for a claim to fame (Sen. *Con.* 10 pr.16). Seneca's project is partly to preserve the memory (and *sententiae*-"copyright") of those declaimers famous in his youth but then nearly forgotten, whose work his contemporaries copied without acknowledgment.[25] Some orators would even exercise the art of writing *sententiae* for days on end in order to build up a stock of material they and their successors could use as the writer's stock-in-trade (Sen. *Con.* 1.pr.23 on Porcius Latro). Thus the idea of winning fame and an afterlife through one's *sententiae* had already been firmly established when Lucan took to writing.

Morford observes that Lucan employs *sententiae* most frequently in the *per-*

---

19. Fantham 2004, 87.

20. Cf. Keith 2000, 17.

21. Cf. Sanford 1934 and below on Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff.

22. Cf Sen. *Con.* 1.22: *nec his argumenta subtexam, ne et modum excedam et propositum, cum vos sententias audire velitis et quidquid ab illis abduxero molestum futurum sit* (But I won't add the arguments that went with them [*sententiae*]—that would be excessive and irrelevant, for it is the *sententiae* you want to hear, and any space I deprive them of will annoy you). Cf. further Sen. *Con.* 2.pr.5 and also *Con.* 7.pr.9. For a recent study of Seneca the Elder's *sententiae* cf. Berti 2007, 155–82, "L'arte della sententia."

23. Fairweather 1981, 28 points to Rolland 1906, Preisendanz 1908, and Rayment 1969. Cf. also Sussman 1978, 157–58 and Danesi Marioni 1999.

24. For Lucan cf. Sussman 1978, 159–60. Many of the contributions to Gualandri and Mazzoli 2003 examine the political and cultural role played by the *Annaei* family; Bonner 1966, 263–64 points to possible influences of Seneca the Elder on Lucan and sees the roots of some of Lucan's *sententiae* in Seneca the Younger's writings.

25. Fairweather 1981, 29 on *Con.* 1pr.10–11 and Sinclair 1995, 122 account for the move of *sententiae* from common property to attributed quotation in a time when oratory under the principate lost much of its political importance and turned instead into a competition for the position of *primus orator.*

oratio (summing up) of a speech in his epic, so as to go out with a bang.[26] Indeed, Quintilian compares the use of final *sententiae* to the concluding request for applause in the comedies and tragedies of old (*plodite*): the end of a speech is the place to use grand and ornate thoughts to move the audience (Quint. *Inst.* 6.1.52). If we apply this to a wider framework, we shall note that all books of Lucan's epic, barring books 1, 3, and 6, end with an epigrammatic or sententious gesture.[27] Nearly every section of Lucan's epic, that bravura funeral speech on the Roman Republic, fades out with a nod toward rhetorical convention and a sententious thrill for the reader.

I have suggested that the increased frequency of *sententiae* springs from an author's or orator's concern with winning recognition and fame. In addition these textual limbs can be excerpted and incorporated into new literary bodies. Perceived as the highpoints of rhetorical art, *sententiae* are seen as lasting legacy. Moreover, we have seen how there is an ancient notion that *sententiae* convey an author's own thoughts. If self-authored, their polished style profiles the author's education, while if they are copied into a text, they display the author's wide reading.[28] Since the right question to ask about a *sententia* "is not whether it is true in any absolute sense, but whether it is convincing in its own particular context,"[29] *sententiae* help to furnish a plausible ethical basis for the presentation of the author's views. They oblige the reader to register events from a very particular and often partisan point of view.[30] Hence *sententiae* partake in an author's specific social ethos. By depicting values and commonly shared beliefs, they help to construct the world of the text for the reader. Consequently, *sententiae* place their user in a position of authority, which often finesses further justification. Correspondingly in one of his letters Seneca fervidly defends the use of *sententiae* as engines of practical ethics:

> Moreover, who can deny that even the most inexperienced are effectively struck by the force of certain precepts? For example, by such brief but weighty saws as: "Nothing in excess," "The greedy mind is satisfied by no gains," "You must expect to be treated by others as you yourself have treated them." We receive a sort of shock when we hear such sayings; no one ever thinks of doubting them or of asking "Why?" So strongly,

26. Morford 1967, 2.

27. Cf. Wick 2004 on *BC* 9.1108.

28. Accordingly Sinclair 1995, 122–32 reads Seneca's *Controversiae* as a tool for the social advancement of the author's family—displaying the father's learnedness and equipping the sons to put theirs on display.

29. Sinclair 1995, 35.

30. Cf. Sinclair 1995, 6 and ch. 3 for a discussion of legalistic rhythms in *sententiae* and Tacitus's role as nomothetic historian.

indeed, does mere truth, unaccompanied by reason, attract us. (Sen. *ep.* 94.43, trans. Gummere)[31]

In short, employing *sententiae* economizes on argumentation and makes sure that no reader is left unclear about the premises of the text.

Finally there is also a competitive element in employing *sententiae*, for "from Aristophanes to Quintilian, we repeatedly come across images of combat and struggle in the description and use of [. . .] *sententiae.*"[32] This notion is most prominent in the writings of Seneca the Elder, who vividly describes clashes between declaimers whose acuity and pugnacity rival that of gladiatorial encounters.[33] What is more, even the authorial self of Seneca the Elder is represented as staging gladiatorial bouts.[34] When applying this imagery to the *Bellum Civile*, that cosmos of staginess and spectacle, we will see how powerfully *sententiae* assist Lucan in fighting his literary cause.

Epigrammatic Force

By writing a rhetorical epic on a historical subject Lucan combines the epigrammatic forces of three generic traditions, oratory, poetry, and historiography, all of which incorporate *sententiae.* Seneca the Elder's literary output bears witness to the wealth of *sententiae* declamations had to offer to both orator and epicist.[35] Moreover, earlier poetry, especially epic, was commonly raided for *sententiae*, and as a result we find numerous lines of Homer and Virgil employed wherever suitable. Much of what we have of Ennius we thus owe to Cicero's habit of garnishing his writings with the former's verses.[36] Third, there is a tradition of

31. *Quis autem negabit feriri quibusdam praeceptis efficaciter etiam imperitissimos? Velut his brevissimis vocibus, sed multum habentibus ponderis: Nil nimis. Avarus animus nullo satiatur lucro. Ab alio exspectes, alteri quod feceris. Haec cum ictu quodam audimus, nec ulli licet dubitare aut interrogare "quare?"; adeo etiam* ***sine ratione*** *ipsa veritas ducit.*

The final *sententia* has been identified as Publilius Frag 2. We can see here how Seneca himself excerpts. For Publilius Syrus p. 90. For a discussion of Seneca *Letters* 94 and 95 focused on *sententia/praeceptum* cf. Sinclair 1995, 91–96.

32. Sinclair 1995, 41.

33. Sinclair 1995, 123–28 offers ample documentation.

34. Cf. Sen. *Con.* pr.4.1 and Fairweather 1981, 29–30.

35. On Lucan and the declamation schools cf. Bonner 1966.

36. Skutsch 1985, 26–46 provides details for Ennius's transmission in Cicero and other prose authors. Collart 1974, 209–12 lists all one-liners from Virgil and Horace. Cf. *Aen.* 1.627, 2.354, and 10.284. Rosenthal 1897, 36–44 classifies Horace's *sententiae* in thematic groups such as *avaritia*, *invidia*, *ira*, *audacia*, *vitia abicienda*, *libidines coercendae sunt.* On Homer with some examples of the reception of his *gnomai* in archaic and classical Greek literature cf. Villemonteix 1979, 93 n. 36. For quotations from Virgil and other classical authors in Augustine cf. Müller 2003. Hagendahl 1947,

sententiae passed on within historiography. Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, Sallust, and Livy all feature examples, and the prominence of this rhetorical device in Tacitus has prompted three recent studies.[37] Caesar's *commentarii*, one of Lucan's direct sources (although strictly speaking not historiography) tap into this tradition as well.[38] In addition we find that the second-century AD account of the civil war in Florus's epitome exploits the seed planted by Lucan's many *sententiae.*[39] However, Lucan's predecessors employed gnomic *sententiae* and not yet the pointed expressions coined by the declaimers. Ovid acts here as mediator between Augustan and later literature. Seneca the Elder reports that Ovid took over many *sententiae* from his teacher Latro and rephrased them in his poetry.[40] Ovid's *sententiae* are programmatic only in that they display characteristic verbal playfulness rather than moralizing content. It falls to Lucan and thereafter Tacitus's historiography to exploit *sententiae* to their full potential by employing both *gnomai* and pointed expressions side-by-side. As we shall see, Lucan succeeds in constructing a marked rhetorical discourse by forming a system with his *sententiae* that undergirds the ideology of his epic. The collapse of "traditional distinctions between oratory, history and epic poetry" in the *Bellum Civile* facilitates Lucan's novel approach of giving weight and giving way to *sententiae* in his epic.[41]

Not only does Lucan lend structure to his many speeches by placing a "terminal *sententia*" at the end point of a passage or even a book, but he also uses *sententiae* as an opportunity to assume the role of commentator in his own text.[42] Following the notion that *sententiae* always contain something of the poet himself, crystallizing his line of thought, we can read Lucan's *sententiae* as his very essence. His moralizing is thus not confined to his frequent apostrophes, but his *sententiae*, too, demonstrate and enhance the perturbed values of his epic world.

In what follows I propose a reading of Lucan through his sententiousness. For his *sententiae* have more than a purely formal or structural function and make an important contribution to the meaning and unity of the *Bellum Ci-*

121 reports that Lactantius quotes altogether 60 lines from Lucretius and 125 from Virgil in his prose work *Div. Inst.* (to this are added Ovid, Lucilius, Terence, Horace, Persius).

37. On the Greek side Thucydides has attracted the most attention; cf. Meister 1955 and Huart 1973. For Tacitus cf. Sinclair 1995, Kirchner 2001, and Stegner 2004.

38. Preiswerk 1945, 213–14 supplies statistics: he counts 10 *sententiae* in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* and 17 in his *Bellum Civile.*

39. Compare Flor. 2.13.4 with Lucan *BC* 1.1.

40. Cf. Sen. *Con.* 2.2.8 and Kennedy 1972, 406.

41. Martindale 1993, 48.

42. Bonner 1966, 264–67 coins the term "terminal *sententia*" and examines some examples in Lucan. Cf. also Morford 1967, 2.

vile. They connect different segments of the epic by patterning the text and by highlighting particular ethical arguments. In this way they help to map out the world of the epic. *Sententiae* also allow Lucan to transcend the immediacy of his poem. In a culture where a text's excerptability was a matter of course, where audiences would eagerly scan texts and anticipate finding *sententiae* that could be added to their own collections, Lucan could even expect a condensed version of his epic consisting of excerpted *sententiae* only, along the lines of Seneca the Elder or the recycled mimes of Publilius Syrus.[43] For fame and afterlife, that contemporary of Caesar now depends solely on a collection of *sententiae* extracted from his plays.[44] Studied as a school text in antiquity and praised by the younger Seneca and Gellius, the collection was still popular in the nineteenth century as edifying reading.[45]

Desbordes imagines Publilius's *sententiae* recontextualized as lines of a play and points to the important function they will have fulfilled in the author's mimes: "If the *sententiae* could figure in the mimes by way of solemn or mocking remarks in the action of the play, moreover, if they, when the opportunity presented itself, could play on the particular situation of the enunciation, this seems linked to the fact that the *sententia* marks a kind of rupture in the discourse in which it appears and that it makes a transition from the particular to the general."[46] Might "*sententiae* only, *à la* Publilius Syrus," be a reading strategy usefully applied to Lucan's oeuvre as well? Are Lucan's *sententiae* meaningful outside their immediate context? What would we as readers gain by lining them up as a chain of reflections in an extended series?[47] The reader easily iden-

---

43. The criticism of Cicero's early speeches in Tacitus's *Dialogus* 22.3 embodies this idea: *nihil excerpere, nihil referre possis, et velut in rudi aedificio, firmus sane paries et duraturus, sed non satis expolitus et splendens* (There is nothing you can extract, nothing you can take away with you: it is just as in rough-and-ready construction work, where the walls are strong, in all conscience and lasting, but lacking in polish and luster). Cf. also what Tacitus lets M. Aper report about the excerpting habits of students of rhetoric in *Dialogus* 20.4.

44. Giancotti 1967, 318–38 suggests various origins for this collection in the first century AD: rhetorical school text, grammatical gradus, or introduction to ethics and philosophy. Publilius is mentioned by Cicero *Ep. ad fam.* 12.18.2 and *Ep. ad Att.* 14.2 and Seneca the Elder (*Con.* 7.3.8), who quotes several of his *sententiae*, as does Gellius *Noct. Att.* 17.14. Trimalchio (Petr. *Sat.* 55) offers 16 Ps.-Publilian *sententiae.* Macrobius *Sat.* 2.7 provides Publilius's biography garnished with a wealth of *sententiae.*

45. Cf. Benz 2001. Seneca himself quotes one of Pub. Syr.'s *sententiae* in *ep.* 94.43; cf. n. 31 above. Knecht 1986, 53–55 points out that the frequent use of paronomasia in *sententiae* (as well as proverbs) made them useful school texts for teaching "beginners' Latin" in antiquity.

46. "Si les sentences ont pu figurer dans des mimes à titre de commentaires sérieux ou malicieux de l'action théâtrale, si de plus, à l'occasion, elles ont pu jouer sur la situation particulière de l'énonciation, cela semble lié au fait que la sentence marque une sorte de rupture dans le discours où elle apparaît et qu'elle fait passer du particulier au général." Desbordes 1979, 75.

47. Rieks 1978, 367.

tifies recurrent topics in Publilius's output such as life and death, change of fortune, justice and injustice, wisdom and stupidity, freedom and slavery. Others, however, remark that "one would not expect a common ethical standard among maxims spoken by different characters in a mime. Some contradict others, as proverbs often do. [. . .] many advocate selfish pragmatism."[48] But evidently the epic format allows Lucan a wider discourse than mime does Publilius. Bonner points to recurrent vocabulary and themes in Lucan's *sententiae*, but he does not undertake a systematic survey.[49] In contrast, the subsequent discussion will make use of Tucker's collection of 502 *sententiae* from Lucan's *Bellum Civile*.[50] When facing the material it will become apparent how versatile and wide the forms are that a *sententia* can take. Lucan's oeuvre offers a large variety, ranging from the gnomic and proverbial ones, which are of more general content, to highly rhetorical ones coined solely to shine for a brief moment in their individual context.

Morales has examined *sententiae* in another large-scale text, Achilles Tatius's novel *Leucippe and Clitophon*.[51] She follows Bennington's notion that "[s]ententious formulations imply a value-judgement grounded in social norms; they transmit a cultural heritage and are inherently conservative."[52] Morales then poses the question, "What are the values and norms in the society of the novel and thus *what sort* of plausibility is relevant to Achilles Tatius?"[53] This approach proves fruitful when looking, as Morales does, only at the generalizing and universalizing statements and descriptions in a text. However—and this will be of particular relevance to my study—Bennington takes such strategies a step further when he states: "Sententiousness becomes no longer so much a "type of sentence" as a *force* in texts [. . .]. This force is not some irrational or metaphysical entity assumed to be at work in texts, but a force of law. If the 'overt' forms of sententiousness lay down the law, the more concealed types [. . .] draw their force from a law laid down, or exploit that law surreptitiously."[54]

When applied to Lucan this will mean not only that *sententiae* classified as *gnomai* contribute to our understanding of the "laws" in a text, but that even those that are rhetorical and situational offer us insights into the workings of the epic world. Accordingly, the anthologies of *sententiae* mentioned above,

48. Fantham and Duff 1996, 1276.

49. Bonner 1966, 264–67.

50. Tucker 1967, 334–84. I must add *BC* 4.52, 4.179, 4.245, 5.317–18, 5.499, 5.783–84, 5.634, 6.282, 7.133–34, 7.488, 7.824, 9.239.

51. Morales 2004, 96–151.

52. Bennington 1985, 9.

53. Morales 2004, 108.

54. Bennington 1985, 62.

Publilius Syrus and Seneca the Elder's excerpts, "are only spectacular surface manifestations" of sententiousness, as they are taken out of speeches or even out of an entire oeuvre of comedies, and not from one continuous story.[55] For what unites the eighteenth-century French novel *Leucippe and Clitophon* and Lucan's epic, and indeed makes them comparable from the aspect of sententiousness, is their narrative trajectory, the fact that they create and put on display their own individual world with its system of values.[56] By looking only at the *sententiae* in any of these works we strip out the narrative and keep only the ideology. Lucan's performance of a story about Caesar and Pompey is then reduced to its ideology, becomes purely ethos—and as a result we are confronted with its essence.

In a similar way my reading also takes temporality out of Lucan and breaks down the linearity of his epic. We suddenly gain a timeless and holistic vision of what is at stake in the *Bellum Civile.* Hunt in his discussion of the imagery of *Aeneid* 12 suggests an approach not dissimilar, for making "visible" the patterns of Virgil's epic, whose overarching structure he imagines in the manner of a triptych: "The principal point, in any case, is that although the story must unfold in time its meaning emerges in a kind of spatial memory—i.e. its organic sense emerges only when the three parts [of the triptych] are held together in a simultaneous vision. If the disparate themes and images were unified into a mental complex grasped spatially as a whole, the pattern of related meanings would fuse in an instantaneous impact, a genuinely comprehensive view whose apprehension would give the true form of the poem."[57]

Lucan himself invites the reader to transcend the linearity of his story. He replants his epic about tyranny into the (safe) past of the Republic. However, here the past informs the present: in *Bellum Civile* 2 the wickedness of Sulla stands in for the horrors of the present civil war. Lucan thus leads the way for his audience to ask what the *Bellum Civile* conveyed to the Neronian reader and consequently has left many a critic wondering about possible pro- and anti-Neronian interpretations. By reading Lucan's *sententiae* we are negotiating this question; we construe Lucan's message while asking what this epic means to us today. My "moralizing" reading supplants the narrative in favor of its *sententiae* and degrades Lucan's epic to a fable that illustrates a moral, a *sententia*, an *epimythion*—or indeed many of them, which in turn then lay down the laws for

55. Bennington 1985, 62.

56. Cf. Bennington 1985, 62: "the text 'in' which sententiousness in found becomes dispersed in an intertext of which sententiousness is a significant trace," while "sententiousness 'itself' is dispersed throughout narratives."

57. Hunt 1973, 84.

the world of his epic. Just as the fable is supplemented by *sententiae*, "the maxim tends to *supplant* the fable, to stand in for it once the fiction has gone."[58]

In what follows I present a selection of thematically related *sententiae*, so that different nuances of near-synonyms and parallel statements become apparent. We will then be able to follow Lucan's discourse of values and concepts in his epic world.

Downfall and Apocalypse

Adhering to the notion that sententiousness is a conservative force, we shall find that many of Lucan's discourses are based on stock material of Roman culture. Through Lucan's sententiousness this material is then presented in a way that makes the audience register it. Accordingly Lucan's obsession with Rome's downfall and apocalypse looks back to an etymological play inherent in the Greek transliteration of Rome into Ῥώμη. For the flattering identity of Ῥώμη and ῥώμη (= strength) in Greek almost cries out for puns and ideological exploitation.[59] However, there is also a darker side to sound and wordplay: the third Sibylline Oracle equates Ῥώμη with ῥύμη (= ruin). That Roman poets were aware of such echoes is confirmed by the fact that both connotations of Ῥώμη are captured in Horace's *Civil War* Epode in the words *suis et ipsa* ***Roma viribus ruit*** (and Rome through her own strength is tottering, Hor. *Ep.* 16.2).[60]

Lucan introduces the first book of his epic with the very same core imagery: *Rome's inability to bear herself* and *mighty structures collapse on themselves* become slogans of this epic's campaign.[61] In addition, these concepts are quickly translated into further images, that of shipwreck and apocalypse.[62] In what follows I shall bring together *sententiae* that partake in the imagery of downfall in the order they appear in the epic. Throughout the image of downfall is evoked again and again and layered into the reader's memory. To complete the picture Lucan makes clear that he is unwriting the *Aeneid: tanti periere* ***labores*** (yet all that toil was wasted, *BC* 6.54).This phrase is a hollow echo of Virgil's invoca-

58. Bennington 1985, 85. Cf. also Henderson 2001, 37 on Phaed. 3.10.

59. On this and the following cf. Macleod 1979, 220–21.

60. Cf. *Or. Sib.* 3.363–64 (repeated at 8.165–66). Macleod 1979, 220–21 discusses various possible translations of ῥύμη (= ruin) and proposes that Horace *Ep.* 16.2 is an extension of sense from its usual meaning of "impetus, rush."

61. *nec se Roma ferens* (*BC* 1.72); *in se magna ruunt* (*BC* 1.82).

62. Cf. *naufragium sibi quisque facit* (and each creates shipwreck for himself, *BC* 1.503); *extremi multorum tempus in unum convenere dies* (at a single time the final days of many have converged, *BC* 1.650–51).

tion of the Muse in the opening lines of the *Aeneid* (1.8–11), where she is asked to remind us of Aeneas's countless labors that led to the foundation of Rome.[63]

The main protagonists are also part of this imagery. While Pompey merely evokes it in his address to Cornelia, Caesar partakes more actively.[64] What is more, Pompey's son is well aware that he will soon name himself "either master of the world or heir to extinction so immense."[65] The self-destructiveness of the Roman project is enhanced in a further rhetorical twist when the soldiers face self-defeating battle that expands into apocalypse.[66] Finally two *gnomai* appear that ring true as much for Rome as Pompey: "So age too long and life surviving after power destroy heroic spirits" is followed directly by "Unless the final day coincides with the end of blessings, by speedy death forestalling sorrows, former fortune brings disgrace."[67] Pompey dragging the world down in his fall marks the end of this discourse on ruin while an image of utter destruction provides closure: "Even the ruins have perished."[68]

Even when read in the order of their appearance, hardly contextualized, and through an orator's eyes on the search for *sententiae*, these examples convey something of the essence of the *Bellum Civile*. They allow us a glimpse into the world of this epic. Lucan comes back to the same issue—the downfall of Rome—again and again from various angles. Whenever the reader's attention is directed to this topic, every time we encounter it, Lucan asks us if we got his point, whether we have thought any more about it, and whether we engage with the world of civil war.

Deconstructing Concepts

Lucan places *sententiae* in his epic to make statements but also to create discourse and sometimes even to undermine concepts and key words. Often the

63. Cf. Bruck 1993 on *labor* in the *Aeneid*.

64. Pompey: *properante ruina / summa cadunt* (with hurrying collapse the highest fall, *BC* 5.746–47). Caesar: *testatus numquam Latiae se desse ruinae* (bearing witness he left nothing undone in Latium's fall, *BC* 6.10).

65. *vel dominus rerum vel tanti funeris heres* (*BC* 6.595).

66. *cladibus irruimus nocituraque poscimus arma* (we charge to disaster, demanding warfare, which will injure us, *BC* 7.60); ***uret*** *cum terris,* ***uret*** *cum gurgite ponti* ([this heap of bodies] will be consumed by fire together with the earth, together with the waters of the sea, *BC* 7.813). The latter *sententia* is marked by *geminatio*.

67. *sic longius aevum / destruit ingentis animos et vita superstes / imperio. nisi summa dies cum fine bonorum / adfuit et celeri praevertit tristia leto dedecori est fortuna prior* (*BC* 8.27–31).

68. *quaerit / cum qua gente cadat* (he seeks a race to share his fall, *BC* 8.504–5); *etiam periere ruinae* (*BC* 9.969).

argument is developed by antithesis, as is the case with the theme of *knowledge,* where two *sententiae* draw into doubt the system and attribution of knowledge as we habitually conceive it.[69] Moreover, as emerged from the examples on the theme of ruin above, there are several wider discourses that span the entire epic. As it is, the term ***pax*** is exploited in many a *sententia.* Some of them introduce a distorted notion of peace, making *pax* a fake euphemism for tyranny. The future *pax Augusta* (Augustan peace) to which civil war leads is thus deconstructed to a *dominatio Augusta* (Augustan tyranny). Even though these *sententiae* appear in different parts of the narrative, they nevertheless all negotiate similar thoughts, communicating with each other across intervals. Thus in *Bellum Civile* 1 "The peace we long for brings a master" sets the foundation on which the following *sententiae* elaborate.[70] In what follows the notion of "Sulla's peace" spells out this very concept, while further *sententiae* point out the flawed nature of peace in this epic.[71] However, to our surprise peace is also offered as a real alternative to civil war.[72] Indeed, peace is to be feared, as it would not only thwart the plans for world dominion of both Caesar and Pompey but also set an end to Lucan's poetic project.[73] We can but wonder if *pax* in Pompey's obituary is to be read as the true or the tyrannical kind.[74] In the end, however, we learn that in the world of civil war the only lasting peace that can be made is with death.[75]

This brief discussion of the instances of the word *pax* in Lucan's *sententiae* has brought to light that often the defining moments for a term are the highly rhetorical ones, those that catch the ear of the reader and attract attention.

---

69. *solis nosse deos et caeli numina vobis / aut solis nescire datum* (To you alone is granted total knowledge of the gods and heaven's powers—or total ignorance, *BC* 1.452–53); *miseroque liquebat / scire parum superos* (it was clear to the unfortunate that the gods above know too little, *BC* 6.433–34).

70. *cum domino* ***pax*** *ista venit* (*BC* 1.670).

71. *omnia Sullanae lustrasse cadavera* ***pacis*** ([I] examined all the cadavers of Sulla's peace *BC* 2.171); *si bene libertas umquam pro* ***pace*** *daretur* (if we ever were right to surrender Liberty for peace, *BC* 4.227). Peace is indeed degraded to a mere name and is never allowed to last. Cf. *trahimur sub nomine pacis* (we are dragged off into slavery in the name of peace, *BC* 4.222) and *et multo disturbat sanguine pacem* (and shatters the peace with abundant blood, *BC* 4.210).

72. *licet omne deorum / obsequium speres, irato milite, Caesar, /* ***pax*** *erit* (Caesar, though you hope for absolute compliance from the gods, if your troops are angered, there will be peace, *BC* 5.293–95).

73. Cf. *pacemque timeret* (and that he feared peace, *BC* 7.55).

74. Cf. *praetulit arma togae, sed* ***pacem*** *armatus amavit* (He did prefer warfare to the garb of peace, but once in armor peace he loved, *BC* 9.199). Cf. also *ille iacet quem paci praetulit orbis* (The man the world preferred to peace lies dead, *BC* 9.229).

75. *pax illis cum morte data est* (Peace with death is given them, *BC* 9.898). Shackleton Bailey 1997 emends *pax illa.*

However, Lucan simultaneously uses these moments to direct the reader's mind toward the ruptures and contradictions in his world of civil war.[76]

A further issue at stake in this world at war is the question of guilt. Civil war makes it considerably harder to hold any one party responsible. Accordingly Lucan examines and questions the notion of guilt and innocence, undermining any attempts at clear-cut recrimination. Looking back to past conflicts, he establishes the concept of *Universalschuld* (communal guilt).[77] However, shortly afterward—we have seen this technique of seemingly corresponding *sententiae* before—Brutus questions this very concept. For in his opinion Cato's approval alone could purify the war.[78] Nevertheless, as becomes clear, Cato will become tainted with guilt if he participates.[79] Everyone will rush to Cato to make him part of communal crime, in which bravery and valor do not earn any honor.[80] Through this subversion of guilt and innocence, crime and virtue, we gain insights into the epic's system of values. Indeed, expressions such as "they delight in their guilt" (***iuvat*** *esse nocentes*, *BC* 4.253).undermine the moral authority of guilt. Moreover the concept of guilt is further relativized as the authority of judgment lies in the end with the winning party.[81] What is more, even in civil war the mind of the soldiers is set on profit. Accordingly they demand the right to loot without guilt.[82] This is why they rush to lay hands on Pompey's camp after the battle: "They race to know the size of their wage of guilt."[83] Despite all the crimes we witness in the approach to Pharsalus and its aftermath, Lucan tells us

---

76. In a similar way the concept of safety is undermined as well: Bonner 1966, 266 notes two striking examples: *dabitis poenas pro pace petita, / et nihil esse meo discetis tutius aevo / quam duce me bellum* (you will suffer for your bid for peace and learn that in my day nothing is safer than war waged under my leadership, BC 3.370–72); *o miseranda domus, toto nil orbe videbis / tutius Emathia* (O pitiable house, in all the world you will see nothing safer than Emathia, *BC* 6.819–20).

77. *periere* ***nocentes,*** *sed cum iam soli possent superesse* ***nocentes*** (the guilty died, but at a time when the only survivors must be guilty, *BC* 2.143–44).

78. *an placuit ducibus scelerum populique furentis / cladibus inmixtum civile* ***absolvere bellum****?* (Or have you decided by involvement with the leaders of crime and the disasters of the frenzied people to make civil war innocent? *BC* 2.249–50).

79. *accipient alios,* ***facient te*** *bella* ***nocentem*** (wars that others will enter already guilty will make you guilty, *BC* 2.259).

80. *quis nolet in isto / ense mori, quamvis alieno volnere labens, / et* ***scelus esse tuum*** (who will not wish to die upon your sword, though sinking from another's wound, and be your crime? *BC* 2.264–66); *qui nesciret in armis / quam magnum* ***virtus crimen*** *civilibus esset* (he did not know how great a crime is valor in civil war, *BC* 6.147–48).

81. *haec acies* ***victum*** *factura nocentem est* (this is a battle bound to make the loser guilty, *BC* 7.260).

82. *imus in omne nefas manibus ferroque* ***nocentes,*** */ paupertate* ***pii*** (We proceed to every crime, guilty in hand and sword, guiltless in our poverty, *BC* 5.272–73).

83. *scire ruunt, quanta fuerint* ***mercede nocentes*** (*BC* 7.751).

that this was only foreplay, for the future will bring worse.[84] Ultimately civil war leads to an inversion of law and order, which also encompasses an inversion of fundamental moral concepts.[85] As a result everybody can be judged guilty in some way or other: "Once the judge of war is changed, no hand is clean."[86]

Directly linked with Lucan's discourse on guilt is his discussion of forgiveness. Lucan's upside-down moral system makes the reader wonder who is to forgive whom.[87] As clemency is one of the prime attributes of Caesar, we can expect to find him lenient toward those inferior in battle;[88] His leniency, however, can also turn into a cruel weapon when Caesar's enforced clemency counteracts heroism and martyrdom and produces shame, not relief.[89] In a world where it is left unclear what is wrong and what is right, the act of forgiving itself is linked to a moral discourse. Usually the side that is forgiven has done wrong, and the forgiving side has been wronged. By rejecting forgiveness, however, Domitius Ahenobarbus resists this classification and opens the roles of good and evil for negotiation. Accordingly he rejoices when he is finally allowed to die in battle. Here Domitius can reconnect to his system of values and earns his share of glory by dying in action.[90] Nevertheless we are far from finding any consistency here that could support generalization. Even this seemingly clear-cut example is tainted, as Lucan's version of the death of Domitius does not bear historical scrutiny.[91]

The general Afranius assesses many of the moral issues surrounding civil war in his speech of surrender (*BC* 4.344–362). As he fights in civil war, he is fighting against friends and equals, a fact he addresses at the very beginning of his speech. In the end there is really only *one* party in this war—that of Rome. Afranius begs Caesar to grant him pardon, in a gesture that acknowledges the

---

84. *Hesperiae clades et flebilis unda Pachyni / et Mutina et Leucas* ***puros*** *fecere Philippos* (The carnage of the west, Pachynus's lamentable wave, and Mutina and Leucas have made Philippi innocent, *BC* 7.871–72).

85. *ius et fas multos faciunt, Ptolemaee,* ***nocentes*** (Law and justice, Ptolemy, make many guilty, *BC* 8.484).

86. ***nulla*** *manus, belli mutato iudice,* ***pura*** *est* (*BC* 7.263).

87. Cf. *solacia fati / Carthago Mariusque tulit, pariterque iacentes /* ***ignovere deis*** (Marius and Carthage had consolation for their fate: both equally prostrate, they forgave the gods, *BC* 2.91–93); *et* ***veniam meruere dei*** (and the gods earned forgiveness, *BC* 4.123).

88. Ahl 1976, 192–97 discusses "The Problem of Caesar's *Clementia*." Cf. also Narducci 2002, 89–90.

89. Cf. *scit Caesar poenamque peti* ***veniamque timeri*** (Caesar knows he wants the final penalty and fears a pardon, *BC* 2.511); *poenarum extremum civi, quod castra secutus / sit patriae Magnumque ducem totumque senatum, /* ***ignosci*** (the citizen's worst punishment for joining the army of his fatherland, his leader Magnus, all the Senate, is—to be forgiven, *BC* 2.519–21).

90. *tunc mille in vulnera laetus / labitur ac venia gaudet caruisse secunda* (now happily he falls beneath a thousand wounds, rejoicing not to have a second pardon, *BC* 7.603–4).

91. Cf. Ahl 1976, 49–53.

parity of the two opposing armies. He thus makes a virtue of necessity by deconstructing the enemy. Accordingly Afranius stresses that his actions were not driven by party enthusiasm but instead represent a continuation of his services to Rome's community (*BC* 4.348–351). The subsequent *sententia* contains Afranius's argument in a nutshell.[92] Pardon also features prominently when Caesar and Pompey's head finally come face to face. Here, however, Caesar's *clementia* degenerates to a farce.[93] The concluding *sententia* of this thematic complex allows a glimpse of Caesar's system of values.[94] As we have seen from the examples cited, my reading strategy of "*sententiae* only" unearths the many paradoxes of civil war and provides a condensed version of Lucan's wider discussion of guilt and forgiving.

Fuga

A further key theme in Lucan's epic that is easily traced and contextualized in Rome's literary output prior to the *Bellum Civile* is that of flight. In his civil war epode Horace tries not so much to find a remedy for civil war as to seek an escape. His entire poem thus echoes with flight: Horaces wishes the Romans to head for the islands of the blessed and ends the epode with the image of *secunda fuga* (happy escape).[95] However, the very Phocaeans whom Horace cites as a success story of escape will end up caught again in a story of war. After traveling west they will found Massilia, a city whose bloody defeat by Caesar's troops Lucan depicts (*Epod.* 16.17–20 and *BC* 3.298–762). In addition the epic tradition, too, provides prominent examples of war fugitives. Aeneas himself is blatantly introduced in the *Aeneid*'s proem as "exiled by fate" (*fato profugus*, Virg. *Aen.* 1.2).[96] We shall flee into founding Rome. His flight provides the start

---

92. Cf. *hoc hostibus unum, / quod vincas, ignosce tuis* (pardon your enemies for this alone—that you are victorious, *BC* 4.355–56). This is precisely what Cato enacts without even being asked. Cf. *poenaque de victis sola est vicisse Catonem* (the only penalty exacted from the conquered was that Cato conquered them, *BC* 9.299).

93. Cf. *sciat hac pro caede tyrannus / nil venia plus posse dari* (Let the tyrant know that for this slaughter nothing more than pardon can be given, *BC* 9.1088–89).

94. Cf. *tunc pace fideli / fecissem ut victus posses ignoscere divis, / fecisses ut Roma mihi* (Then in lasting peace I could have helped you in defeat forgive the gods; you could have helped Rome forgive me, *BC* 9.1102–4).

95. Cf. Hor. *Epod.* 16.41–42; *aere dehinc ferro duravit saecula; quorum / piis* ***secunda*** *vate me datur* ***fuga*** (with bronze and then with iron did he harden the ages, from which a happy escape is offered to the righteous, if my prophecy is heeded, *Epod.* 16.65–66). Mankin 1995 *ad loc.* points to the uniqueness of the junction of *secunda* and *fuga.*

96. Austin 1971 *ad loc.* states "*Profugus* is regularly used of Aeneas and the Trojan migration" and provides a wealth of examples.

for another narrative and connects to a recurrent form of human experience: after flight there will be some re-formation of community.[97] In contrast, Lucan's epic journey inverts Aeneas's project: we do not flee *into* founding Rome but rather *from* founding Rome. In a world of civil war Lucan caps the logic of running away by inverting the flight. In contrast to the *Aeneid*, this time there will be no escape; accordingly the reader is constantly pricked by *sententiae* that question the rationale of *fuga* (flight).

The very first *sententia* nurtured by this discourse *sic urbe relicta / in bellum fugitur* (so deserting the city they flee into war, *BC* 1.503–4) thus makes clear in what direction the epic is moving, not constructively toward Rome but destructively away from it, and that both physically and ideologically. What is more, Lucan takes delight in spelling out subversion and lack of direction.[98] Those who flee civil war are respected.[99] Those who win it are put to flight.[100] Moreover, what one *Magnus* calls flight, the other perceives as triumph.[101] This, however, is not the only food for the reader's thought. Lucan also exercises a "perversely aestheticized etiquette" in regard to killing on the battlefield.[102] The concept of honorable death in action is lost in flight when those fleeing are killed *as if* they were fighting heroically.[103] In addition, the traditional structure "who flees whom" of conventional narrative is frequently troubled and put at risk when not the living but the dead flee death, all Pompey's troops flee one man, and war flees Caesar.[104] Furthermore, those who are branded deserters are not those we would expect.[105] Uniquely, Cornelia provides her husband with a place to flee to, a rarity in this epic of aimless flight (*BC* 5.759).

---

97. Lucan, too, incorporates ktistic stories in the *Bellum Civile*. In addition to the tale of Massilia he tells us that Brundisium was founded by Dictaean (= from Mt. Dicte) settlers who were fugitives from Crete Cf. *BC* 2.610–12. Moreover, we also encounter Celts, fugitives from an ancient race of Gauls, who are reported to have merged with the Iberians (*BC* 4.9–10).

98. Accordingly the poet writes flight even into the heavens: *nubes . . . nimbos rapuere fuga* (the clouds swept along the rainstorm in their flight, *BC* 4.68–70). Flight also subverts norms; thus tombs are full of fugitives (*busta repleta fuga*, *BC* 2.152) and sacrificial victims flee the altars (*BC* 7.165–66).

99. Cf. *civis, qui fugerit, esto* (treat the man who flees as a citizen, *BC* 7.319).

100. Cf. *victore fugato* (the conqueror is put to rout, *BC* 7.824).

101. Cf. *heu demens, non te fugiunt, me cuncta secuntur* (What delusion! It is not you they flee but me they follow, *BC* 2.575).

102. Cf. Leigh 1997, 217.

103. Cf. *excipiant recto fugientes pectore ferrum* (as they run away let them receive the weapons full in the breast, *BC* 4.166).

104. Cf. *fugere cadavera letum* (corpses have escaped from death, *BC* 6.532); *ne solum totae fugerent te, Scaeva, catervae* (from you alone, Scaeva, fled all his squadrons, *BC* 6.249); *bellum te civile fugit* (civil war is deserting you, *BC* 5.316).

105. Cf. *fida comes Magni vadit duce sola relicto / Pompeiumque fugit* (Magnus's loyal comrade, she [Cornelia] goes alone, leaving the general, and runs from Pompey, *BC* 5.804–5).

Bellum Civile 9 in particular features many attempts to come to terms with the flight from the battlefield of Pharsalus. Here *sententiae* communicate with each other and develop the same set of thoughts throughout the sequence. From the book's very beginning onward, the march through the desert is construed as an *aristeia*, and this allows the fugitive soldiers to win back their lost honor. Accordingly, already at the book's opening they appear like a victorious fleet.[106] What is more, Cato in his rebuke makes clear that what is to come is *more than* simply flight.[107] Indeed the Libyan desert turns out to be a greater challenge, a trauma far worse than the battle of Pharsalus.[108] Hence Cato's soldiers wish themselves back to Thessaly; in addition they yearn to be pursued by Caesar's troops in their flight. His soldiers, too, will suffer the very hardships they are enduring themselves.[109] However, we can also interpret all this negatively and see these challenges as punishment for flight: the Libyan desert constitutes the soldier's penalty and Ptolemy Pompey's.[110] Last, the epic ends where the flight ends—but there is no escape from civil war.[111]

As we have seen from my discussion, Lucan creates a discourse on escape and flight in civil war through his *sententiae.* In each of them he thematizes and questions this topic and its complex ramifications and paradoxes in a world at war. In what follows I shall examine three smaller thematic units, which are represented in Lucan's sententiousness.

No Winners

At all costs Lucan must hammer home that there can be no winners in civil war, only losers, an antithesis the poet frequently exploits in his *sententiae.* One of the markers of this discourse is the revaluation (and devaluation) of Roman triumph. Already at the epic's very outset Lucan takes pains to insist that there

---

106. Cf. *quis ratibus tantis fugientia crederet ire / agmina, quis pelagus victas artasse carinas?* (Who would think that on so many vessels traveled troops in flight? Or that for conquered ships the sea was too narrow? *BC* 9.34–35).

107. Cf. *ignavum scelus est tantum fuga* (a coward's crime is mere flight, *BC* 9.283).

108. Cf. *sola potest Libye turba praestare malorum / ut deceat fugisse viros* (Libya alone with its brood of evils can show that it is honorable for warriors to have fled, *BC* 9.405–6).

109. Cf. *reddite, di, clamant miseris quae fugimus arma, / reddite Thessaliam* (they shout: Gods, give back to us in our distress the battle that we fled, give back Thessaly, *BC* 9.848–49); *solacia fati / haec petimus: veniant hostes, Caesarque sequatur / qua fugimus* (This comfort in our doom we ask for: let our enemy come here, let Caesar follow where we flee, *BC* 9.879–80).

110. Cf. *poena fugae Ptolemaeus erat* (the penalty of rout was Ptolemy, *BC* 9.1087).

111. Cf. *via nulla salutis, / non fuga, non virtus; vix spes quoque mortis honestae* (no path of safety is there, not flight, not heroism; hardly can he even hope for honorable death, *BC* 10.538–39).

are no triumphs to be won in this war.[112] Accordingly a series of corresponding *sententiae* communicates that neither Pompey nor Caesar will achieve a triumph. Pompey attempts to build on his earlier triumphs, but in vain.[113] Caesar's campaign in Gaul, however, would merit a triumph, but he forfeits this privilege by marching on Rome.[114] Moreover, in this war it is not always the conqueror who draws the better lot.[115] What is more, victory is not always perceived as positive, for punishment awaits the winner.[116] The impossibility of achieving success in this conflict makes us wonder yet again for whose good this war is actually waged.[117]

Fear

In Lucan's epic things always become worse than we could ever fear.[118] In a war from which there is no escape route, fear is an omnipresent constant.[119] Indeed Lucan reminds us forcefully in his *sententiae* that the two concepts fear and flight are intertwined and interdependent.[120] As so often, the leaders function

112. Cf. *bella geri placuit nullos habituros triumphos* (did you choose to wage wars that would bring no triumphs, *BC* 1.12). Indeed triumph appears as an institution that has lost its justification (7.233–34).

113. Cf. *omnes redeant in castra triumphi* (let all my triumphs return to my camp, *BC* 2.644). This contrasts with *lassata triumphis / descivit Fortuna tuis* (exhausted by your triumphs, Fortune has deserted you, *BC* 2.727–28).

114. Cf. *perdidit o qualem vincendo plura triumphum!* (what a triumph he lost by conquering more! *BC* 3.79).

115. Cf. *hoc petimus, **victos** ne tecum **vincere** cogas* (this we seek—that you do not compel the conquered to conquer with you, *BC* 4.362); *omne malum **victi,** quod sors feret ultima rerum, / omne nefas **victoris** erit* (the conquered will have every hardship brought by final destiny, the conqueror will have every crime, *BC* 7.122–23); cf. also *victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni* (the conquering had the gods on their side, the conquered Cato, *BC* 1.128).

116. Indeed the epic raises this problem at the very outset: *usque adeo miserum est civili vincere bello*? (Is victory in civil war so very terrible? *BC* 1.366). Cf. *vincere peius erat* (to win was worse, *BC* 7.706); *paratque / poenam victori* (and prepares punishment for the winner, *BC* 6.801–2); *nunc neque Pompei Brutum neque Caesaris hostem / post bellum victoris habet* (you have a Brutus now enemy not of Pompey nor of Caesar, but of the victor when the war is over, *BC* 2.283–84).

117. Caesar runs the war for himself: *iam certe mihi bella geram* (now for myself, assuredly, I will wage war, *BC* 5.357). Pompey has Cato checking on him: *ideo me milite vincat, ne sibi se vicisse putet* (with me his soldier let him conquer then, to stop him thinking that he conquers for himself, *BC* 2.322–23).

118. Cf. *non fanda timemus; sed venient **maiora metu*** (unutterable are the things we fear, but soon our fears will be exceeded, *BC* 1.634–35).

119. Fear is written into the epic world. Cf. *extimuit natura chaos* (nature dreaded chaos, *BC* 5.634). It extends to the most basic human interrelations. Cf. *matremque suus conterruit infans* (the mother was terrified by her own baby, *BC* 1.563).

120. As ever Lucan does his best to undermine these terms: *non timidi petiere fugam, non proelia fortes* (the fearful did not seek escape nor the brave battle, *BC* 4.749).

as examples in Lucan's discourse: Caesar for his part relishes his fear-inspiring role.[121] He depends, however, entirely on his soldiers to maintain it.[122] Pompey's fall on the other hand is at least partly caused by his own fear, and he fulfills his own gloomy prediction.[123] Since fearlessness counts as a necessary precondition for a successful tyrant, Caesar is rightfully angry at his fear.[124] In this epic it is the fearless we need to fear most.[125] The only thing Caesar has to fear is peace or mutiny.[126] The soldiers for their part heap their hopes and fears onto their leaders; this keeps them from worrying about themselves.[127] Fear of death, however, is, as Lucan reminds us, omnipresent, always individual but nonetheless universal.[128]

Mors

The *Bellum Civile* is packed with death. Lucan makes us believe that *mors* (death) waits in every corner of the Roman Empire for each and every one. Any page and any line can contain another grisly example. However, the poet also takes this as an opportunity to philosophize about death. Among all the bloodshed, the authorial voice solicits us not to fear death and to see philosophy as the death of fear. Lucan provides us with philosophical stock material, inserting

121. Cf. *gaudet tamen esse timori / tam magno populis et se non mallet amari* (Yet he rejoices to be so dreaded by the people and would not prefer to have their love, *BC* 3.82–83).

122. Cf. *usque adeone times quem tu facis ipse timendum?* (So much do you fear the man whom you yourself make fear-inspiring? *BC* 4.185). Moreover Caesar's soldiers grant him freedom from fear: *tradimus Hesperias gentes, aperimus Eoas, / securumque orbis patimur post terga relicti* (We hand to you the western races, we open up those of the east, and we allow you freedom from fear about the sphere left behind your back, *BC* 4.352–53).

123. Cf. *tantoque duci sic arma timere / omen erat* (and for a general so great to dread the fight like that was ominous, *BC* 7.340–41) and Pompey's prediction: *multos in summa pericula misit / venturi timor ipse mali* (simply fear of future evil has sent many into utmost danger, *BC* 7.104–5).

124. Cf. *virtus et summa potestas / non coeunt; semper metuet quem saeva pudebunt* (Virtue and the highest power are not compatible. The man ashamed of cruelty is always fearful, *BC* 8.493–94); *et timet incursus indignaturque timere* (He fears attack; is angry at his fear, *BC* 10.444).

125. Cf. *meruitque timeri / non metuens* (and his fearlessness deserved to be feared, *BC* 5.317–18). Apart from that, the hungry and greedy do not know fear. Cf. *nescit plebes ieiuna timere* (a starving people knows not terror, *BC* 3.58). *usque adeo solus ferrum mortemque timere / auri nescit amor* (to this extent the love of gold alone knows no fear of sword or death, *BC* 3.118–19).

126. Cf. *pacemque timeret* (and that he feared peace, *BC* 7.55); *militis indomiti tantum mens sana timetur* (Only the sanity of his unbridled troops makes him afraid, *BC* 5.309).

127. Cf. *metus hos regni, spes excitat illos* (**fear** of tyranny arouses these, those **hope** *BC* 7.386); *non vacat ullos / pro se ferre metus: urbi Magnoque timetur* (There is no time to feel terror for themselves: they fear for Rome and Magnus, *BC* 7.137–38).

128. Cf. *mille modos inter leti mors una timori est / qua coepere mori* (Among a thousand ways to die the only one men fear is the way they have begun to die, *BC* 3.689–90).

a substratum of *sententiae*, which he administers to his audience. We cannot help but register it, contemplating our own (and Lucan's) mortality while reading. As the poet does his best to take fear out of death, although he does not present a coherent philosophical system, we are confronted with a barrage of therapeutic dicta on death. Death can count as the middle of life, a blessing, or simply nothing at all.[129] In addition, death is the only certainty in life.[130] It comes as no surprise, then, that we frequently encounter *sententiae* that hail the value of suicide.[131] How to die is all we need to know.[132] It seems therefore that a good death is the only way to display virtue and the only honor to be gained in this war.[133] Death thus constitutes a reward, not to say a delight, and only those dead already are fortunate.[134]

At the end of my brief survey of Lucan's sententiousness we have arrived at a reading of his pointed formulations that insists on their importance as part of discourses on key themes of his epic. Lucan's *sententiae*, far from being mere rhetorical stucco, lay down the law and inscribe the ethics of civil war. The force of these one-liners cannot be demonstrated better than by pointing to Lucan's cluster of *sententiae* that sets off the speech of Pothinus. Here the poet exults in rhetoric but is also determined to make clear whose standards rule Egypt. The whole passage encapsulates Lucan's sententious project of laying down the law within its few verses.

---

129. Cf. *longae, canitis si cognita, vitae mors media est* (if what you sing is known for fact, then death is the mid-point in prolonged life, *BC* 1.457–58); *felix esse mori* (that death is a blessing, *BC* 4.520); *aut nihil est sensus animis a morte relictum / aut mors ipsa nihil* (either no feeling is left to the mind by death or death itself is nothing, *BC* 3.39–40).

130. Cf. *quisquamne secundis / tradere se fatis audet nisi morte parata?* (Is there anyone who dare entrust himself to favorable Fates except with death available? *BC* 8.31–32); *mutantur prospera vita, / non fit morte miser* (in life prosperity is changed, death does not make a man unhappy, *BC* 8.631); *me non oracula certum / sed mors certa facit* (No oracle makes me certain, certain death does, *BC* 9.582–83).

131. Cf. *vita brevis nulli superest qui tempus in illa / quaerendae sibi mortis habet* (Life that remains is short for no one who finds in it the time to seek death for himself, *BC* 4.478).

132. Cf. *scire mori sors prima uiris, set proxima cogi* (To know how to die is the warrior's best lot, the next to be compelled to die, *BC* 9.211); *disce ferire / disce mori* (learn how to strike, learn how to die, *BC* 5.363–64).

133. Cf. *mors, utinam pavidos vitae subducere nolles, / sed virtus te sola daret* (Death, I wish that you would not remove the fearful from life but that you could be bestowed by valor alone, *BC* 4.580–81).

134. Cf. *et mortem sentire iuvat* (they delight to feel death, *BC* 4.570); *numinis aut poena est mors immatura recepti / aut pretium* (early death is the penalty for taking in the deity, or the reward, *BC* 5.117–18); *vanam spem mortis honestae / concipis: haud, inquit, iugulo se polluet isto / nostra, Metelle, manus* (empty are the hopes of honorable death that you conceive: my hand will not pollute itself with your slaughter, *Metellus BC* 3.134–36); *o fortunati, fugiens quos barbarus hostis / fontibus immixto stravit per rura veneno* (O how blessed are those laid low through the fields by the barbarian enemy who in flight mixed poison in the springs, *BC* 4.319–20).

8.484 *ius et fas multos faciunt, Ptolemaee, nocentes.* (Law and justice, Ptolemy, make many guilty.)
8.485–6 *dat poenas laudata fides, cum sustinet inquit / quos fortuna premit.* (Loyalty, though praised he said, pays the penalty when it supports the people Fortune crushes.)
8.486–7 *fatis accede deisque, / et cole felices, miseros fuge.* (Side with the Fates and gods, and court the fortunate, avoid the failures.)
8.487–8 *sidera terra / ut distant et flamma mari, sic utile recto.* (As stars are different from earth and flame from sea, so profit is from right.)
8.489–90 *sceptrorum vis tota perit, si pendere iusta/ incipit.* (All the might of scepters disappears if it begins to weigh justice.)
8.490 *euertitque arces respectus honesti.* (Regard for what is honorable overthrows citadels.)
8.490–91 *libertas scelerum est quae regna inuisa tuetur / sublatusque modus gladiis.* (Unrestricted wickedness is the defense of hated tyrannies and limit removed from sword).
8.491–2 *facere omnia saeve/non inpune licet, nisi cum facis.* (You cannot act brutally without penalty unless you always do.)
8.492–3 *exeat aula/ qui volt esse pius.* (Let him who wishes to be good leave the court.)
8.493–4 *virtus et summa potestas/ non coeunt* (Virtue and the highest power are not compatible.)
8.494–5 *semper metuet quem saeva pudebunt.* (The man ashamed of cruelty is always fearful.)

Pothinus employs *sententiae* at the beginning of his speech to build up authority so that young King Ptolemy may follow his subsequent suggestion to murder Pompey. All his statements sound true in their own right and need no further justification. In this way Pothinus projects the desired response to his plan, a strategy that succeeds. All advisors nod off the crime, and the boy king commands murder. What is more, these *sententiae* also serve to characterize Pothinus, the word is the man, and illustrate the working ethics of the Egyptian court if not even the entire civil war in a nutshell.

Antiproverb

Previously we have discussed how *sententiae* can be used to serve as all-convincing argument and construct authority for the speaker; and the same is, of course, true of proverbs, from which gnomic *sententiae* stem. It is hard

to argue against the universal appeal of a proverb. A striking example can be found in Plautus, *Mercator* (374–75), where the son—naturally in a weaker position than his father—throws back one of the latter's proverbs, so as to produce a disarming excuse and escape further paternal attention.

> *saepe ex te audivi pater:*
> *rei mandatae omnis sapientis primum praevorti decet.*
>
> [But, Father, I have often heard you say yourself: all sensible men should give a commission their very first attention.]

As we have seen in the speech of Pothinus, Lucan employs a similar technique to construct a position of authority. In addition he also makes use of it whenever he brings himself into his text, since most of his statements consist of or culminate in a *sententia*, a term that in his time embraces both *gnomai* and their rhetoricized offspring. Many of these, however, employ linguistic structures akin to those of proverbs. In what follows I shall examine Lucan's poetic technique in creating his *sententiae*, turning first to folklore theory.

To provide analytical tools for research into proverbs Dundes posits a "finite number of proverb compositional or architectural formulas."[135] He divides them into "equatorial proverbs," which serve identificational ends, and "oppositional proverbs" with contrastive features. The former follow formulas such as "*A* = *B*," "He who is *A* is *B*" and "Where there's an *A*, there's a *B*." The latter consist of statements such as "*A* ≠ *B*," "*A* is less than *B*" or "*A* is greater than *B*," and "better *A* than *B*."[136] Lucan's *sententiae* are characterized by the fact that they seem to follow one of these structures, which is then somehow perverted.[137] Ahl hits the nail on the head when he wonders about the meaning of *felix se nescit amari* (*BC* 7.727): "Is it just some kind of proverb: 'A happy man does not know that he is loved'? I must admit that I am unable to detect the existence of any such proverb."[138] Even though *felix se nescit amari* pretends to follow the

135. Cf. Dundes 1981, 46.

136. Cf. Dundes 1981, 53–54. In rare cases we even find proverbs that contain both identificational and contrastive features. Cf. Dundes 1981, 57.

137. Rosenthal 1897, 23–24 examines the structure of Horace's *sententiae* and identifies key words such as *omnis* (all), *nemo* (nobody), *nihil* (nothing), *numquam* (never), *semper* (always) and *raro* (rarely). On Lucan's style Bartsch's observes his "odd use of 'and' where we would read 'and not,'" which fits well into his program of converted conventions. Cf. Bartsch 1997, 124.

138. Cf. Ahl 1976, 174. He is not the only one who feels the need for some explanation: Arnulf of Orleans *apud* Marti 1958, comments *ad loc.*: *Felix quia quamdiu aliquis est in prosperitate nescit quis diligat eum ex animo et quis non, quia omnes pari vultu* ("Happy" because, as long as someone is in good fortune, he does not know who loves him from the heart and who does not: for all keep the same face).

simple scheme of *A* = *B* (*felix* = *se amari*), the verb ***ne**scit* runs counter to the reader's expectation. While we would happily nod at *felix se scit amari*, Lucan leaves us with the shell of a proverb and by the slightest of alterations contrives to baffle. One medieval scholiast rose to the bait; he responded to what he read by setting the proverb right: *Felix se nescit amari quoniam iuxta felices adulatio est, iuxta miseros amor* (A happy man does not know that he is loved because flattery stays close to the successful, but love close to the unlucky).[139]

I suggest that Lucan deliberately *verfremdet* (alters into alien forms) the proverbial code in his *sententiae*.[140] He uses the structural basis of the proverb to create *antiproverbs*, which display the characteristics of those in the tradition but are doctored to suit the demands of Lucan's poetic world.[141] Mieder, who has published extensive collections of German and English antiproverbs, defines their function: "Just as well known proverbs continue to comment about our daily life, so do new anti-proverbs by using alienating and shocking linguistic strategies."[142]

One frequently employed proverbial formula is "Where there's an *A*, there's a *B*." It is easy to show that this structure is common in Latin proverbs.[143] However, while these examples all pair up two positive items, and indeed two negative terms would work just as well, Lucan undermines the format and employs an identificational structure for what ought to be a contrastive proverb. He equates plus with minus, *fas* (right) with *merces* (pay) in the line ***ibi** fas **ubi** proxima merces* (there lies right—where pay is nearest, *BC* 10.408). Readers not only find their proverbial preconceptions overthrown, but also the very concept of *fas* put in jeopardy.

A further proverbial structure is exploited in ***quidquid** multis peccatur **in**ultum est* (The offense of many goes unavenged, *BC* 5.260). Plenty of examples demonstrate that *quidquid* is a word common at the beginning of a moral axiom of the form *A* = *B*.[144] Again Lucan here adapts an identificational structure to forge an opposition. We would expect to find *quidquid peccatur* = *ultum est* instead of *quidquid peccatur* = *inultum est.* Minimal alteration inverts proverbial into antiproverbial.

In a similar manner Lucan will provide all the vocabulary needed to create

139. Cf. Usener 1967 *ad loc.*

140. For a similar technique in Brecht's literary output cf. Woods 1968.

141. Sherzer 1976 demonstrates how Beckett makes creative use of the "gnomic code" in *Molloy* by modeling newly created proverbs according to the code's conventions.

142. Mieder 1999, 3.

143. ***Ibi** semper est uictoria, **ubi** concordia est* (There is always victory, where there is concord, Pub. Syr. 59); cf. also Pub. Syr. 61, Sen. *de vita beata* 8.6 and Plaut. *Aul.* 197.

144. ***Quidquid** dei dicunt, id decretumst dicere* (All that the gods say, must be called a decree, Plaut. *Most.* 667); cf. also Ter. *Ph.* 243 and Sen. *Consol. ad Helv.* 8.4.

a conventional proverb, so that swapping two words would put things right. *Servat multos fortuna **nocentis** / et tantum **miseris** irasci numina possunt* (Often their good fortune guards the guilty, and the deities can only be enraged with the unlucky, *BC* 3.448–9) in a world without civil war should read (unmetrically) *servat multos fortuna **miseros** / et tantum **nocentibus** irasci numina possunt* (Often fortune guards the miserable, and the gods can only be enraged with the guilty). This antiproverb thus plays with our expectations by providing all the terminology one would expect but switching terms within the rhetorical structure.

Why is Lucan so keen on turning identificational structures into contrasting ones? Clearly enough, the cult of rhetorical paradox extends even to the inversion of the gnomic code. Lucan exposes our expectation of finding a coherent moral system in his epic by poisoning and corrupting the gnomic tradition, and means us to understand and appreciate the strategy. His constant identification of contrasts and "equation of opposites"[145] point us toward provocative discourse on his epic world's founding terms, death, fear, and so forth, in a rhetorical campaign to stump and stun the reader. "The means of producing oppositions in proverbs is strikingly similar to the means of producing oppositions in riddles. However, whereas the oppositions in riddles are resolved by the answer, the oppositional proverb is itself the answer to a proverb-evoking situation, and the opposition is posed, not resolved. In this sense, proverbs only state problems in contrast to riddles, which solve them."[146] Lucan's antiproverbs then help to furnish the unreconcilable oppositions of his world at war, for which he cannot provide a solution.

Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff

My emphasis on Lucan's *sententiae* finds further confirmation in an early modern reading of the *Bellum Civile.* In 1695 unknown friends of Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1626–1692) published, posthumously, his translation of the *Bellum Civile,* the first ever into German, prefaced by a collection of and commentary on 300 edifying *sententiae* ("*lehrreiche Sprüche*") culled from Lucan's epic.[147] Seckendorff is praised as one of the most influential and educated men in seventeenth-century Germany.[148] The list of his publications ranges from an "owner's manual" for small principalities, instructions for a Christian life, and

145. Bartsch 1997, 50–52.
146. Dundes 1981, 60.
147. Seckendorff 1695.
148. Cf. Fischli 1943, 69.

examples of his orations, to one of the most celebrated defenses of Lutheranism.[149] Seckendorff's view of antiquity is shaped by his attitude that literature, even though perceived as entertainment, ought to fulfill a morally edifying function.[150] Furthermore, Seckendorff's approach to the state is clearly a integrated and organic one, "where the state is an organism and its *common weal* can only be understood in its totality [*Ganzheit*]," an attitude that closely shares Lucan's vision of Rome as a body in pain.[151] Lucan's subject matter was acutely pertinent to Seckendorff, who lived through the Thirty Years' War, which left Germany depopulated and in ruins, and resulted in the loss of his father's life and the uprooting of his family.[152] It worked to Lucan's advantage that his epic is free from "immoral" vocabulary. In Seckendorff's reading, however, even though Lucan is "not tainted by disgraceful words" he nevertheless contains "a secret poison of pagan philosophy," which needs to be eliminated through explanation and instruction.[153] For this very reason Seckendorff chose to preface his translation of Lucan with 300 political and moral discourses on select *sententiae* from the epic.[154] These provide the opportunity for Seckendorff to "correct" any of Lucan's thoughts he disapproves of, and to spin out and back up those that fit his mind-set of seventeenth-century Christian stoicism.[155] In a preface Seckendorff repeatedly stresses the didactic benefit of his literary project, in terms of both moral edification and general education. He means to provide access to Lucan for those whose Latin has become rusty; in addition, the layout of his political and moral discourse opens the epic up to the orator in search for a *sententia* to garnish his own speech. Not only are Latin verses and German translations provided together with individual discussions of varying length for each entry, but there are also side-glosses and brief classifications for those skimming, as well as a register of topics at the end.[156] One might reason-

---

149. Cf. *Teutscher Fürsten Stat* (1656), *Christenstaat* (1685), *Teutsche Reden* (1686), *Commentarius historicus et apologeticus de Lutheransimo* (1688).

150. Seckendorff 1695, Vorrede a7. Cf. also Hor. *ars* 343–44.

151. Reinert 2005, 226; cf. also 228 on Seckendorff's view of the state as *corpus politicum.*

152. For Seckendorff's biographical background cf. Fischli 1943, 69–70, Reinert 2005, 221–22, and Strauch 2005, 21–36 and 57–58.

153. Cf. "*nicht mit schandbaren Worten befleckt; ein heimlich gifft der heydnischen Philosophie*" (Seckendorff 1695, "kurzer Bericht vom Lucano" 6).

154. "*Politische und Moralische Discurse über M. Annei Lucani dreyhundert auserlesene lehrreiche Sprüche*"; Gundolf 1930, 11 condemns Seckendorff's output as anachronistic and awkward; Fischli 1943, 76–77 on the other hand sees Seckendorff's language as meriting more detailed stylistic examination and praises its "surprising force and brevity," which comes close to the original pathos of Lucan's Latin. For the intellectual context of Seckendorff's project cf. Zeller 2011.

155. Fischli 1943, 71.

156. Side glosses and classifications at times come close to proverbs themselves. Cf. 4.275 *Wider verzweifelte ist gefährlich zu fechten* (to fight against the desperate is dangerous); 4.535 *Ein recht getrostet herz wird von keiner Unruhe verwirret* (a steady heart remains unperturbed).

ably suspect that this collection originated at the time of Seckendorff's position as librarian at the court of Saxony-Coburg, back at the beginning of his distinguished career, when he had had to excerpt and then report on books to his ever-so-busy master Herzog Ernst.[157] Some *sententiae* fit Seckendorff's Lutheran project better than others: his combined comment on *BC* 4.373–77 and 4.381 amounts to six pages of rant against the luxuries of food and drink, whereas he usually confines himself to about one page of commentary for each *sententia.* Seckendorff takes *satis est populis fluviusque Ceresque* (The river and Ceres are enough for the people, *BC* 4.381) as proof of Roman parsimony, and comments: "These and the following words that have been excellently written by pagans against luxury and in praise of parsimony in food and drink should put to shame all Christians."[158] This Christianisation of Lucan exemplifies Seckendorff's Lutheran approach to Lucanian Stoic morality as detailed in his preface: "My aim is that the gift of God, which is perceivable through nature and sheds its light even onto pagans, can be noticed and honored even in this profound and instructive author Lucan, but simultaneously it should be acknowledged how much better and more thoroughly Christian morals can be learned from the word of God."[159] Accordingly, traces of "light" are already to be found in Lucan, but they need to be unearthed and explained by Seckendorff to his Christian readers.

However, Seckendorff also shows himself well aware of the original context of the Latin quotations he employs before he ventures into more general fields with his interpretations. His comment on *variam semper dant otia mentem* (leisure always breeds fickleness, *BC* 4.704) is a prime example: "Even though here actually the *mood* of the soldiers is meant and one is well advised not to allow them too much spare time if one could employ them to greater deeds lest they lose their courage, escape, plot treason, and similar things, nevertheless it is also apt and useful to remark that idleness (as well as other vices) is cause and reason of fickleness and capriciousness."[160] The reader is then gently pointed to

157. Fischli 1943, 72 and Strauch 2005, 32 with n. 1.

158. *Diese und folgende Worte welche von heyden wider die verschwendung und zu lobe der genügsamkeit in essen und trinken fürtrefflich geschrieben solten billig alle christen beschämen.*

159. *[Doch habe ich] besonders aber dahin gezielet daß man die gabe Gottes in der natur oder deren licht welches auch die heyden gehabt zwar aus diesem sinn- und lehrreichen autore, Lucano, anmercken und nicht geringe halten aber zugleich in obacht nehmen möchte wie viel höher und gründlicher die christliche sitten-lehre aus Gottes wort zu schöpfen und zu treiben [ist].* Seckendorff 1695, Vorrede a6.

160. *Obwohl hier eigentlich von dem* humor *der soldaten geredet und daher geraten wird man solle ihnen wenn man sie zu einer wichtigen* action *gebrauchen könne nicht viel müssige zeit verstatten dieweil sie dadurch den muth sincken lassen und auf ausreissen verrätheren und dergleichen gedencken; so ist es es doch eine gemeine und nützliche anmerckung dass der müssiggang wie andere*

the moral values inherent in Lucan's epic. A further technique of Seckendorff is to transfer a Lucanian *sententia* into a German proverb. Thus on *in turbam missi feralia foedera regni* (tyranny's ill-omened pact shared among a crowd, *BC* 1.86) Seckendorff starts off with pondering the vagaries of democracy, which is fated to fail because of the human condition:[161] "The most profound reason is human malice, namely envy, resentment, self-interest, *amour-propre*, selfishness."[162] Shared power would only have a chance when given to peerless people. However, "because fear of God and virtue are very rare among the people, even the upper classes, and even those of high office and power have great shortcomings and faults, the **proverb** will indeed remain true that **many dogs gnawing on the same bone do not stay peaceful,** for they are all hungry and envious."[163] Clearly, what Lucan has to tell to the German reader is readily translatable into low-register imagery that makes it ever more accessible.

Seckendorff's comments on *vincere peius erat* (to win was worse, *BC* 7.706) tell us that he, too, noted the chains of *sententiae* on similar topics;[164] they also shed light on his political reading of the *Bellum Civile*: "Lucan speaks enthusiastically against the evil regime of Nero, driven by the anachronistic and vain vision of reviving the ancient freedom of the Roman nobility."[165] Moreover, they show how Seckendorff engages with Lucan's Stoicism: "It has to be accepted as the truth that poverty, exile, and even death if suffered with a clear conscience are better than the greatest riches, power, and luxury gained through injustice. A pagan with a natural and secular mind could not recognize the deeper meaning of this, even though Stoic philosophy gave this issue great prominence, for they held as a precept (among others) that a wise and virtuous man in great poverty or even subjected to torture and execution is happier than a tyrant in all his glory. There is something in this philosophical precept, but it is more

---

laster mehr also auch der unbeständigkeit und veränderlicher unnützer anschläge ursache und anlaß sei.

161. One should take note that Lucan precedes this excerpt with *nec umquam* (never); Seckendorff's selections can be partial.

162. *Der unterste Grund ist die menschliche boßheit, nemlich der neid, die mißgunst, der eigennutz, die eigenliebe, die eigenehre.*

163. *Weil aber die gottesfurcht und tugend so gar etwas seltsames unter den menschen auch bey hohen ständen ist, und die, welche in hohen würden und gewalt sitzen, auch ihre großen mängel und fehler haben, so wird freylich das* ***sprichwort*** *wohl wahr bleiben* ***dass viele an einem bein nagende hunde nicht einig bleiben*** *denn sie sind gemeiniglich alle hungrig und neidisch.*

164. He points to *BC* 7.123 *omne malum victi* (the conqueror will have every crime) stating: "Nearly the same has been noted above and is touched upon elsewhere as well" (*Fast dergleichen [. . .] ist oben N. CLVII. in acht genommen worden auch anderswo berühret*).

165. *Lucanus redet aus grossem eiffer wider das böse regiment des Neronis, und aus unzeitiger vergeblicher begierde die alte Römische adels-freiheit wieder zu erleben.*

imagination than reality."[166] He then proceeds to discuss the shortcomings of the Stoic concept of *virtus*, which, unaware of the Fall of Man and deprived of the revelation of the Holy Scriptures, fails to tackle mankind's tendencies toward all evil.[167] He concludes that the consolations of Stoicism compare to what Christianity has to offer like "a painted or carved image to the real beautiful body itself or like dirty dust and soil to finest gold."[168]

This survey of Seckendorff's techniques for explaining and Christianizing his selection of *sententiae* demonstrates that a reading of the *Bellum Civile* attuned to sententiousness is rewarding, precisely because it unearths Lucan's system of values. Rather than being a "modern" imposition, this reading brings out the strength of the poem's energetic formulation of its key themes. Seckendorff confronts us with a strategy that goes *with* the grain of this textuality and reminds us that one of the reasons for the epic's extraordinary popularity has always been its excerptability.[169] Lucan's sententiousness constitutes a strategy apparent to readers through various stages of reception. Paying attention to the poet's striking formulations of the ideological stakes of this epic provides a strong reading of the *Bellum Civile* in tune with the rhetorical culture in which Lucan operated.

166. *Dieses mag man aber für grund und wahrheit annehmen daß armuth, verjagung und der tod selbst wo man gutes gewissen behält besser sey als das grösseste reichthum, herrschaft und wollüstiges leben mit unrecht erworben. Dieses hat ein Heyde als ein natürlich und weltlich gesinneter Mensch nicht gründlich zu erkennen vermocht wiewohl nach der Stoischen Philosophie viel dergleichen ruhms gemacht worden, indem sie unter andern für eine regul [sic] hielten, ein weiser und tugendhafter mann wäre glücklicher in der größten armuth oder gar auf der folter und unter dem henckerschwerdt als ein tyrann in seiner größten herrlichkeit. [. . .] Etwas ist an dieser Philosophischen lehre, aber mehr einbildung als nachdruck.*

167. *[. . .] denn sie wussten nichts von dem Abfall unserer ersten Eltern; daher verstunden sie auch nicht die unaussprechliche verderbung nemlich die verfinsterung des verstandes und die verkehrung des willens zu allen bösen neigungen und thaten.*

168. *. . . ein gemahlt oder geschnitztes bild gegen einen schönen cörper selbst oder unsauberer staub und erde gegen dem feinstem golde.*

169. Arnulf of Orleans provides us with an earlier didactic reading of the *Bellum Civile* (Murgatroyd 2009). In his opinion it serves to deter people from fighting a similar war (*Intencio sua est tractare de hac historia, tum ut populo Romano placeat et senatui,* ***tum ut ceteros a consimili bello deterreat*** (Marti 1958, 3 *accessus* l. 15).

CHAPTER 4

The Anatomy of Repetition

The subject matter of Lucan's epic constitutes a turning point of Roman history, when a society that has turned static or "cold," to use Lévi-Strauss' terminology, is forced to change. Cold societies have a tendency to neutralize changes through repetition so as to maintain an ideal state. Hot societies, on the other hand, try to define themselves in opposition to their ancestors. Change is thus much more rapid. With the knowledge they have of their past they wish to reorientate the future and to legitimize or criticize the evolution of their society. History then becomes an element of moral conscience.[1] In my final chapter I would like to suggest a reading of Lucan's poetics of repetition that not only reverberates with the concept of the open and closed body of the text but also mirrors the conflict between "hot" and "cold" in his epic. In what follows I shall look at two different kinds of repetition in the body of Lucan's epic. One is verbal repetition, which is a distinct and much noted sylistic feature of Lucan's writing. The other kind figures the repetition of events and patterns, a feature on which Lucan frequently comments. Repeating the same elements, as in music and architecture, reveals the underlying form, the anatomy of Lucan's epic body.[2]

Lucan's epic does not serve any ideology but, as we have seen in previous chapters, functions rather as a vessel for Lucan's fame. The narrative of the *Bellum Civile* does not follow any forceful trajectory—unlike in the *Aeneid* no future Rome constantly lurks in the background and no world history has to be seen through to the present day as in the *Metamorphoses*. This leaves Lucan at

1. Cf. Johnson 2003, 113–14 on Lévi Strauss's distinction between "cumulative" and "stationary" histories.

2. Cf. Johnson 2003, 99–100 on the role of repetition in Lévi-Strauss's *The Structural Study of Myth*.

ease to structure his epic in an unconventional and at times episodic way. He seems to break with tradition deliberately and has earned himself a reputation as a maverick poet.

We keep telling ourselves that Imperial Latin literature finds ways to communicate how it means to function. Metatheatrical, metapoetic, or metaliterary comments signpost for the reader what the poet's aims are and what he does to achieve them. Often these help to define a poet's place in the literary tradition by illustrating his awareness of influence, his consciousness of the burden of the past.[3] Accordingly, the poetic successors' desire to outdo their literary predecessors is often written into their output. From the outset Seneca's *Thyestes* thus announces crimes worse than those previously committed. In the prologue the ghost of Tantalus warns of what is to come:

> *iam nostra subit*
> *e stirpe turba quae suum vincat genus*
> *ac me innocentem faciat et* ***inausa audeat***
>
> [Now from my stock there is rising a crew that will outdo its own family, make me innocent, and dare the undared.] (Sen. *Thy.* 18–20)[4]

Key words relating to this idea are scattered over the entire prologue: all will be worse, new, and more: ***peius*** *inventum est?* (Has something worse been devised? *Thy.* 4); ***peius*** *fame* (worse than hunger, *Thy.* 5); ***nova/*** *supplicia* (new penalties, *Thy.* 13–14); ***addi*** *si quid ad poenas potest* (if anything can be added to my punishment, *Thy.* 15).

Similarly Lucan's *Bellum Civile* promises in its first line to tell of war *greater than* civil war, a phrase that could be interpreted as a heading for the entire opus. *Bella per Emathios* ***plus quam*** *civilia campos / iusque datum sceleri canimus* (Of wars across Emathian plains, worse than civil wars, and legality conferred on crime we sing, *BC* 1.1–2). When read under these terms, Lucan stages a conflict between two *Magni* (great ones) for the role of the *Maior* (greater one). Critics have frequently emphasized the desire of the Neronian poets to outdo their literary fathers, to commit poetic patricide. Accordingly, Lucan's epic, which constantly looks back to Virgil, has been hailed as both anti- and über-*Aeneid.*[5] When Virgil's proem announces *arma virumque* (arms and the man), we can easily make out what these key words refer to. Lucan also employs a plural, *bella civilia* (civil wars), at the beginning of his *Bellum Civile.* He, how-

3. Bloom 1973 has established literature's "anxiety of influence."
4. Cf. with Tarrant 1985 *ad loc.* Cf. Seidensticker 1978 on the *maius* motif in Seneca's *Thyestes.*
5. Cf. Narducci 2002 and Albrecht 1999.

ever, causes us to wonder if there is more than one war told here, and whether this civil war in fact stands in for all of them.[6]

What is more, readers of Neronian literature can not only detect an awareness of literary succession but also diagnose a syndrome of repetition. We witness a constant retelling, rewriting, and rephrasing of the literary tradition, our sensitivity to which has been enhanced by the advent of intertextuality. Thus in Seneca's *Thyestes* the initial question by the ghost of Tantalus *in quod malum transcribor?* (*Thy.* 13) is not only meaningful in its immediate context: "To what new sufferings am I shifted?" "To what punishment am I being re-assigned?"[7] It shifts to register as "Into what evil am I being copied? For committing what evil am I being reassigned to another writer?" When taking the metaphor of writing literally this verse also indicates that Seneca is here helping himself to a portion of the literary tradition.[8] He reawakens a (literary) spirit to supply narratological energy from hell initiating a story, which will be a repetition of Tantalus's own crimes.[9] Tantalus is forced by the Fury to cause the reiteration of evil in his family's successive generations. The murder and exploitation of Thyestes' children is not a novel crime; his meal's ingredients are as much taken from the past as they eat into the future. While Tantalus's crime on Pelops is reiterated, the play's last line also functions as a "to be continued" announcement (*te puniendum liberis trado tuis* "for punishment I leave you to your children," *Thy.* 1112). Thanks to their poetics of repetition Seneca's tragedies thus read as a key matrix for the narrative techniques of the *Bellum Civile*. For Lucan, too, displays and imposes awareness that he is telling an already well-known story. Accordingly he can afford to take the historical tradition for granted in his narrative; the reader will have to make sure he knows what happened at Pharsalus, for Lucan will not tell us: *quidquid in hac acie gessisti, Roma,* ***tacebo*** (whatever you did in this battle, Rome, I shall not tell, *BC* 7.556).

Pointed toward the literary tradition in this way scholars have understandably been keen to identify the prose sources Lucan versifies and to highlight where Lucan rests on them and where he makes independent moves.[10] A recent reading of Lucan is directed toward reconstructing Livy and presses the ques-

6. Cf. Henderson 1998a, 169. Casamento 2005 examines the role of the conflicts under Marius and Sulla in Lucan's epos.

7. Cf. Fitch 2004 and Tarrant 1985 *ad loc.*

8. Schiesaro 2003, 28 n. 4 suggests "metadramatic resonances, if for no other reason than its etymological reference to writing."

9. Cf. Hardie 1993, 60–65 for the role of Furies in setting off a narrative.

10. Pichon 1912 argues that Livy is Lucan's sole source; Bachofen 1972 favors Caesar; Rambaud 1960 sees Lucan working against the grain of Caesar's propaganda. The author Caesar, however, invades Lucan's epic as a forceful character. Cf. Ahl 1976, 190–230. Lintott 1971 examines Lucan's fidelity to the ancient historiographical tradition.

tion of what value the *Bellum Civile* might be if read as a historical source.[11] In contrast this chapter looks for possible influences and motifs from Caesar's *Bellum Civile* in Lucan's epic by discussing the "Raft of Vulteius" episode (*BC* 4.402–581). The reader will see what ballast Lucan takes on board his poetic ship (or raft in our case). As "the events narrated in Lucan's text themselves symbolize the process of creating text," it is telling to see what elements Lucan incorporates into his epic body.[12] Once I have established the way in which Lucan works his literary predecessors, I shall employ this material for a wider discussion of Lucan's poetics of repetition. In this vein, I set out to examine Lucan's epic technique and to ask once more how he composes his song of *nefas* (sacrilege).[13]

Cosmic Cycles

Virgil set the example of an epic in which the entire cosmos serves as the stage for a struggle for power, enhancing Rome's role as the *caput mundi* (head of the world) and flattering the Romans' consciousness that they were destined to rule the world.[14] This relation between cosmos and *imperium* has been firmly established by Hardie's fundamental study.[15] He also points to the dualism of heaven and hell inherent in the *Aeneid* and demonstrates how this dualism maps onto the epic landscape, "where there is an alternation between places and times evocative of the Elysian Fields (or its close relative the landscape of the Golden Age) and waking Hells."[16] Ovid reacts to the Virgilian model with an all-inclusive *Weltgedicht* ranging from the creation of the earth to the final *katasterismo*s of Caesar and the immortalization of the poet.[17] Lucan thus inherits a well-developed epic cosmology, which he appropriates and develops further. This is made clear by the opening line of his epic's narrative proper, which with the phrase ***fert animus*** (my spirit leads me) instantly alludes to the opening of Ovid's *Metamorphoses:* ***fert animus*** *causas tantarum expromere*

11. Radicke 2004.

12. Masters 1992, 25.

13. On the repetitiveness of Lucan's subject matter, i.e., his negotiation of the previous civil wars, cf. Grimal 1970, 88–89.

14. Hardie 1993, 57.

15. Hardie 1986.

16. Hardie 1993, 58–59.

17. For Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as universal history cf. Ludwig 1965, 74–75; Solodow 1988, 29–34 defines the *Met.* as universal poem.

rerum (My spirit leads me to reveal the causes of such great events, *BC* 1.67).[18] And following this vein, one has read the *Bellum Civile* as a metamorphosis from republican freedom to slavery under Julius Caesar.[19]

Lucan's first simile (*BC* 1.72–80) compares Rome's fate with the destruction of the universe and thus provides a first indication of the scale of the *bella plus quam civilia* (wars more than civil, *BC* 1.1), announced at the poem's very beginning. It exemplifies how the expectations the *plus quam* motif raises can only be met by a universal conflict. Thus an opening bid is made for a cosmic perspective, for universal poetry.[20] Furthermore Lucan also integrates an image of sibling strife, even a conflict between twins, into this apocalyptic vision (*fratri contraria Phoebe / ibit* "Phoebe (Moon) will confront her brother (Sun)," *BC* 1.77–78). This image finds its equivalent in the murder of Remus by Romulus (*BC* 1.95), which marks the beginnings of Rome and of Roman history with years counted *ab urbe condita* (from the foundation of the city) and is also mirrored in the civil war, which throughout the epic is frequently interpreted as Rome's end (*funera mundi*, e.g. *BC* 7.617–18). Additionally Lucan's insistence on Rome's humble origins evokes and reinforces the image of the past growth but also the impending fall of Rome (*BC* 1.97). For civil war will shrink Rome and drain it of its inhabitants. The Romans leave Rome: *sic* ***urbe relicta*** */ in bellum fugitur* (so they abandon Rome and flee into war, *BC* 1.503–4). Moreover, so many of Roman stock die that Rome has to be refueled with foreign blood (*BC* 7.540–43). This also propagates Lucan's circular view of history. He adopts a concept akin to Stoic cosmology, for which the ring-composition of the prophecy of the *matrona furens* (raging matrona) at the end *of BC* 1 is symptomatic.[21] From ***video*** *[. . .] latosque* ***Philippos*** (I see the plain of Philippi, *BC* 1.679–80) the raging woman returns—driven by *iterum* (again, 1.692) and *rursus* (again, 1.693)—to ***vidi iam,*** *Phoebe,* ***Philippos*** (Philippi I have seen already, 1.694).[22] When put into a wider perspective, the cycles of Roman history thus mirror the ever-circling movements of the heavenly bodies and the final return of the cosmic order to primeval chaos.[23] The cosmic body exemplifies the return

18. Cf. Getty 1940 *ad loc.*; Wheeler 2002 examines Lucan's reception of the proem to the *Metamorphoses.*

19. Cf. Tarrant 2002, 356.

20. Miura 1983, 209.

21. Cf. Long 1985.

22. Cf. Schiesaro 2003, 27 on *iterum* (again) as a metaliterary mark and 177–220 for repetition in Senecan drama.

23. Cf. *BC* 1.90–91 for the ever-cycling heavenly bodies; cf. *BC* 1.75–77 for the cosmos' return to chaos for which Tarrant 2002, 357–58 provides Ovidian parallels. Cf. further Leigh 1997, 299–303 on cycles of Roman history.

to (Ovidian) ur-chaos, into which Rome is about to slide: *antiquum repetens* ***iterum*** *chaos* (reverting to primeval chaos, *BC* 1.74). In contrast, however, to the doomed Roman body as exemplified by expressions such as *nec se Roma ferens* (Rome's inability to bear herself, *BC* 1.72), the cosmos also displays elements of eternal order. It thus keeps a "natural" balance, a feature that is as persistent as the human thirst for power (*BC* 1.89–93). Even Nero as cosmocrator is admonished to keep up this balance (*librati pondera caeli / orbe tene medio* "maintain the mass of heaven poised in the sphere's midpoint," *BC* 1.57–58).

Moreover, Lucan is keen to stress the role of Rome as *the* world power and cannot emphasize enough that Rome reigns over land *and* sea (*BC* 1.83 and 1.96). The notion that Roman *imperium* covers the whole world ultimately lends justification to Lucan's hyperbolic alignment of Rome with the cosmos and justifies the analogy between the Roman state and the cosmos, which Lucan plays out repeatedly in the passage *BC* 1.65–97. Additionally the programmatic *certatum totis concussi viribus orbis* (a conflict waged with all the forces of the shaken world, *BC* 1.5) from the epic's prologue evokes the notion of a worldwide conflict, while the words of the elders in *BC* 2.225–32 make clear that *more than* Marius's and Sulla's Rome is at stake in the current war.

Virgil's epic storm and Ovid's primordial chaos serve to set their respective epics off. In the same vein Lucan introduces at the very beginning of his narrative an apocalyptic vision of the cosmic body descending into chaos; with the *Bellum Civile* he creates a Götterdämmerung. This vision of chaos then offers material for recurrent reworkings on different scales and provides Lucan's epic with narrative vigor. In addition, it also suits the epic's episodic structure. Accordingly in the first book imagery of chaos and destruction finds further embodiment in the entrails of the sacrificial victim slain by the priest Arruns (*BC* 1.616–30) and rounds this very book off with the collapsing body of the *matrona furens* (raging matron, *BC* 1.695). Simultaneously it also directs the reader toward the epic's climax. As *Bellum Civile* 1 and 7 are carefully linked by cosmic imagery, the reader is led to expect an all-destructive finale at Pharsalus.[24] Moreover, the cosmic body provides numerous portents, which stress the analogy between the downfall of Rome and the downfall of the universe: *superique minaces / prodigiis terras implerunt, aethera, pontum* (and menacing gods filled earth and sky and sea with prodigies, *BC* 1.524–25). We find this chain of portents in a world cluttered with personifications, embodiments of cosmic phenomena such as Phoebe, Titan, Mulciber (= Vulcan), and Tethys. Therefore it also teems with body language, which leads us straight into the core of Rome (*media . . . Roma*, *BC* 1.560). This focalization is enhanced by the movement of

24. Cf. Miura 1983, 222.

the portents down from heaven toward earth and mankind, from ill-omened birds to beasts and people's offspring (*BC* 1.558–63).[25] In view of that, the suffering of the Roman body is prefigured by the distortion of the cosmic one. Yet Rome is not only under the gaze of heaven, but also plagued by the inhabitants of the underworld; an Erinys is circling Rome (*BC* 1.572), Sulla's shade is seen, and Marius raises his head (*BC* 1.580–83). In the first book of his epic Lucan centers on Rome, which is itself turned into an image, for which Lucan invents a multitude of representations and embodiments such as the personification of *Roma* (*BC* 1.186–92) and the *duo capita* (dual lobes) at Arruns's sacrifice (*BC* 1.627–28). In addition, throughout *Bellum Civile* 1 Lucan will keep the analogy between the Roman body and the cosmic body present by means of similes. Lucan is bent on linking the fate of the cosmos with that of Rome, seeing in the rise of Rome a repetition of creation and the establishment of order, and in the civil war a return to the primeval chaos, out of which will rise again a brave new world, that of the principate. Accordingly the proem (*BC* 1.33–45) already offers a comparison of civil war with gigantomachy as the precondition for establishing a new world order—one might argue, however, that this circular cosmic vision could imply that even the principate will not last forever.

Historic Cycles

Stepping back from this cosmic perspective we find that the dynamics of repetition are written into the storyline *of Bellum Civile* 2 on a smaller scale. Here the older generation lament the fact that they have to see a second civil war in their lifetime: *oderuntque gravis vivacia fata senectae / servatosque* ***iterum*** *bellis civilibus annos* (they detest their long-enduring lot of oppressive age, their years preserved for civil war a second time, *BC* 2.65–66). Lucan jumps at this opportunity to write against the backdrop of an earlier war and creates a foil that then can be superseded by the *nefas* (sacrilege) of a second civil war. Through Lucan's demonstrative retreat into reticence at Pharsalus the slaughter of the earlier war serves as a substitute and stands in for the second.[26] Therefore what at the beginning of *BC* 2 seems to be just one of Lucan's frequent excursuses is emphatically pushed into becoming the main narrative, and points directly to repetition. Furthermore Lucan's digression enables him to tell of fighting in Rome itself, at the heart of the Roman *imperium*, the capital of the world. As we have seen earlier, the concept of *caput mundi* (head of the world) and the

25. On this focalization cf. Miura 1983, 227.
26. Cf. Masters 1992, 212–13 on Lucan as the *vates* of *nefas*.

antagonists' struggle for it is scrutinized throughout the entire epos and finds its ultimate embodiment and culmination in the decapitation of Pompey. The bloody effects of anger unleashed, which is the primordial emotion in civil war, is among the other motifs this first civil war illustrates in detail: *resolutaque legum / frenis ira ruit* (anger raced away, released from the bridle of the laws, *BC* 2.145–46).[27] The war also introduces the imagery of piles of bodies and heads in heaps on market squares (*BC* 2.160–61), a demonstration of Lucan's delight in compressing and heaping up materials, in stockpiling for later (re)use.[28] One miniature image that, as I will argue, is taken up in the Vulteius passage in *BC* 4 is the Herculean idea of constructing one's own funeral pyre and dying in dignity while this is still possible (*BC* 2.157–59), an idea that also embodies the Roman aristocratic ideal to be left in control of one's own time and manner of death.[29]

All this, so the epic tells us, we shall encounter again in the future: *haec* ***rursus*** *patienda manent* (these sufferings await, again to be endured, *BC* 2.223). Lucan even frames the narrator's speech in *BC 2* with *iterum* and *rursus* in a ring-composition. As Lucan's review of previous civil war in *BC* 2 makes plain, the poet will recycle poetic material to construct his war as a rhetorically amplified and greater version. This time it will be a true world war: *multumque coitur / humani generis* ***maiore*** *in proelia damno* (the rush to battle brings much greater loss to humankind, *BC* 2.225–26). Opened up for its own repetition and reception, the civil war in *Bellum Civile* 2 sets the standards Lucan aims to supersede.

Civil war slaughter can reshape the world by crossing boundaries and breaking limits. Hence it can not only change human bodies, but also has an impact on the Roman state body and the cosmic body. The hyperbolic descriptions of dams constructed from bodies (*BC* 2.214) emphasize this conflict's destructive but also creative energy. Civil war simultaneously unmakes and remakes the world. In his proem Lucan acknowledges the new world order, but he also bewails depopulated cities and uncultivated fields, the changed landscapes brought about by war. Large-scale construction is thematized in Lucan's extensive descriptions of Caesar's military building works and landscaping at Brundisium, Massilia, and Ilerda, probably inspired by Caesar's civil war account.[30] Masters has drawn parallels between Caesar's military earthworks and deforestation and the poem-as-building metaphor, which interprets poetry as textual construction, and he has invested these military and technical passages

27. On anger in the *Bellum Civile* cf. Fantham 2003.
28. For a list of heaps and masses, cf. Masters 1992, 145 n. 119.
29. On the *amor mortis* motif in Lucan cf. Rutz 1960.
30. Cf., e.g., Caes. *Civ.* 3.43.

with metapoetical meaning.[31] What is more, we also find this poem-as-building topos melded with the poem-as-sea-voyage topos. This lead obliges us to take a closer look at the actual raft of Vulteius in what follows.[32]

The Raft of Vulteius (*BC* 4.402–581): A Case Study

In this section I shall unearth Lucan's poetics of repetition on different levels. First I will suggest that the Vulteius passage in *BC* 4 shows an awareness of repetition and retelling. Then I will look for inspiration and motifs Lucan might have drawn from his prose sources and reworked in the Vulteius episode. Finally I will address Lucan's strategy of repetition in more general terms.

The Vulteius episode is emphatically self-contained, and, as with many other parts of Lucan's episodic narrative, its immediate function in the grand plot remains unclear to the reader. Lucan makes play here with the axiom that he is telling us a story that is already well known. Thus he causes the reader to wonder where and by whom the rafts are built, and it remains unclear until *BC* 4.445 in what direction the rafts and the narrative with them are actually moving. This suggests a Livian account of this episode, the knowledge of which Lucan presupposes in his audience and on which he presumably relies for much of the technical detail.[33] With his palpably enigmatic design Lucan draws attention to the fact that he makes the rafts cross the sea twice, thereby already writing repetition into this passage. The poet then focuses on the second time the vessels travel filled with people. However, anyone acquainted with Caesar's *commentarii* will surely remember that empty ships, too, are indeed thought of as being worth burning in a civil war—if only for tactical reasons.[34] So why does Octavius then wait to attack and restrain his fleet? The reason given is this: *cursu crescat dum praeda* ***secundo*** (for his prey should be increased by a prosperous /second passage, *BC* 4.435), introducing a play on the two meanings of *secundus* as both "favouable" and "second"—repetition is even written into enemy attacks.

Finally Lucan tells us himself that it is not the first raft that is caught nor the second but the third!—*nec* ***prima*** *nec* ***illam / quae sequitur*** *tardata ratis, sed*

31. Masters 1992, 32–34.

32. Masters 1992, 34 n. 59.

33. Radicke 2004, 294–95.

34. Cf. *Civ.* 3.8.3 on Caesar's empty ships returning to Italy to fetch more soldiers: *omnesque incendit eodemque igne nautas dominosque navium interfecit, magnitudine poenae reliquos deterrere sperans (*[Bibulus] burned them [the ships] all, putting the crews and captains to death in the same blaze, in the hope of deterring the rest by the enormity of the penalty).

tertia *moles haesit* (neither the first raft nor the next was checked, but the third hulk stuck, *BC* 4.452–53). Read with awareness of the literary tradition, Lucan seems to remind us that the first poetic raft was famously constructed for carrying the Argonauts as eternalized by Apollonius's epic. Lucan follows here on these epic tracks by constructing his own raft. Previously he has given his own very short account of the Argo myth (*BC* 3.192–97), pointing out the dangers of seafaring, that "new form of death" (*mors una*). Building on this Argonautic framework in the Vulteius episode Lucan will turn this *mors una* (collective death) into a *mors unica* (unique death, *BC* 4.509). In this literary vein the second raft that remains uncaught might then look back to the construction of a raft in an earlier episode in the *Bellum Civile*: *sed rudis et qualis procumbit montibus arbor / conseritur stabilis navalibus area bellis* (but wood is joined together, rough as it falls on the hills, to make a steady site for war at sea, *BC* 3.512–13). Redirected toward Lucan's own account of the sea battle at Massilia in *BC* 3 we find the term *ratis* scattered over this episode no less than 19 times. We actually have seen it all before. The reader will also remember other boats whose course was hemmed: once in a previous civil war on the Tiber by a dam made of bodies (*BC* 2.212) and then again when Pompey escapes from Brundisium but two of his ships are caught (*BC* 2.711).When Vulteius's raft finally enters center stage in *BC* 4 the readers experience a déjà vu in their awareness that Lucan is putting his poetics of repetition on show.

Vulteius then stages an exemplum. His and his troops' bilateral suicide reads as a civil war in miniature. It is a micro-image of the larger conflict in whose context this passage is set: *totumque in partibus unis / bellorum fecere nefas* (the others fight, and on one side performed the entire crime of wars, *BC* 4.548–49). Here, too, brothers kill brothers and sons fathers: *fratribus incurrunt fratres natusque parenti* (brothers charge at brothers and son at father, *BC* 4.563). Such a miniature version of civil war can also be found in Caesar's account, where an armed conflict is about to break out between different Pompeian parties among those enclosed in Corfinium (*Civ.* 1.20.3). While Roman history repeats itself in seemingly endless cycles of civil war, literature as well looks back and repeats what has been told before. For Lucan cites two mythological examples from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, which he compares to Vulteius's civil war fighting: Cadmus' earth-sprung warriors and the men born from the dragon's teeth in the Medea myth (*BC* 4.549–56). Already in their Ovidian incarnation Cadmus's as well as Medea's men bear the mark of civil war: the "fratricidal strife" of the former (*civilibus . . . bellis*, *Met.* 3.117) matches the fighting of the latter (*acies civilis* "internecine strife," *Met.* 7.142). In addition both Ovidian accounts are linked to the sphere of spectacle. The birth/growth of Cadmus's men in particular is likened by Ovid to the raising of a curtain in the theater: *crescitque seges*

clipeata virorum:/ sic, ubi tolluntur festis aulaea theatris [. . .] (and the crop grows with the shields of warriors: so on festal days when the curtain in the theater is raised . . . , *Met.* 3.110–11).[35] Cadmus's and Medea's men then transmit their civil war down to future generations, spelled out once more in repetition by Vulteius's men.

In Lucan's epic the Vulteius episode is neither the first time that our attention is directed toward people dying in a boat, nor will it be the last. The reader here witnesses a repetition of elements from the Massilian sea battle such as a father committing suicide—in a boat—when he sees his son dying (*BC* 3.721–51); at the same time we can make out forebodings of Pompey's death—staged in a boat as a spectacle of the inner self (*BC* 8.610–62). What is more, the bodies of Vulteius's men can be seen as representing both the Roman state body in its dissection and the Roman military body in general. The limbs of the military body turn against their leader (even if voluntarily), who on his part stands in with his body for his men. As indeed no other named individual dies, Vulteius's death here serves as a representation of his men's death. In addition parallels have been drawn between Vulteius and Pompey, who is killed by a deserted soldier, a former limb of his military body.[36] In the same way in which Vulteius's raft is a micro-image of civil war, Pompey's body can be equated to that of the whole *imperium Romanum*, with his head eulogized as *caput mundi.*

Caesar's Civil War and the Vulteius Episode

Spectacle

There is no direct Caesarian source for the Vulteius episode beyond two short references to it made by Caesar in retrospect.[37] The latter of these strongly suggests that a report on the incident was at least planned or if composed has been lost in transmission.[38] However, I propose that it is nevertheless possible to identify some Caesarean motifs and general themes that may have inspired

35. Cf. also the role vision plays in the story of Medea's men: *ubi viderunt* (when they saw, *Met.* 7.131) and *vidit* (when she saw, *Met.* 7.135).

36. Bartsch 1997, 156 n. 36.

37. Cf. [*se*, i.e., Caesar] *morte Curionis et detrimento Africani exercitus et Antoni militumque deditione ad Curictam* (. . . while Caesar himself had suffered the death of Curio and disaster to his African army, and the surrender of Antonius and his troops at Curicta, *Civ.* 3.10.5) and *illi castra defenderent, fortissimeque Tito Pullieno, cuius opera proditum exercitum C. Antoni demonstravimus, eo loco propugnante* (The resistance in this area was lead by Titus Pullienus, by whose agency, **as we have shown**, Gaius Antonius's army had been betrayed, *Civ.* 3.67.5).

38. Cf. Radicke 2004, 290.

Lucan's poetic output. One of the key issues of the Vulteius episode that has recently attracted scholarly attention is its inherent notion of spectacle and engagement.[39]

Potential models are on offer from two passages in Caesar's *Bellum Civile* where the killing of men is turned into a spectacle and then used as a powerful tool to demoralize the opponent's troops and to increase the confidence of one's own soldiers. Thus in the first book of Caesar's account of the civil war the Caesarians kill four cohorts of Afranius's men ***in conspectu*** *utriusque* (in sight of both armies, *Civ.* 1.70.5). The effect is described as devastating and rated a great success by Caesar: *erat occasio bene gerendae rei. neque vero id Caesarem fugiebat, tanto* ***sub oculis*** *accepto detrimento, perterritum exercitum sustinere non posse [. . .] cum in loco aequo atque aperto confligeretur* (Here was an opportunity for notable success. Caesar did not fail to realize that an army terrified by suffering such a loss under their very eyes would not be able to hold out [. . .] if there was a battle on open and level ground, *Civ.* 1.71.1). Furthermore the captives from the battle of Dyrrachium are handed over by Pompey to Labienus, who publicly (*in* ***omnium conspectu***) puts them to death to great effect (*Civ.* 3.71.4). As a result the Pompeians are thrilled: *his rebus tantum fiduciae ac spiritus Pompeianis accessit, ut non de ratione belli cogitarent, sed vicisse iam sibi viderentur* (These events put such confidence and courage into the Pompeians that they did not reflect on the nature of the struggle, but considered themselves to have won already, *Civ.* 3.72.1). In a fashion not dissimilar, the deaths of the Vulteius episode as well will leave the Pompeians and the reader behind in amazement: *ducibus mirantibus ulli / esse ducem tanti* (And their leaders are amazed that to any man a leader can be worth so much, *BC* 4.572–73).

Lucan opens the Vulteius episode with a focalization in which he directs the reader's view (*BC* 4.402–10). He takes his starting point from the worldwide perspective of *totum . . . per orbem* (all the world), thereby again universalizing the extent of this war. Then he narrows the reader's outlook down to the Adriatic Sea and finally the island of Curicta, where on the shore's edge Antonius has been enclosed by enemy troops. One might read strength of will into Vulteius's name and character by suggesting a wordplay on *velle-vult.*[40] In addition the Vulteius episode also features a multitude of viewing and seeing vocabulary, personified by *Vult*-eius himself, the face-man, as Henderson dubbed him.[41] Much of the action in this episode is motivated by the desire to be seen or to remain hidden. There is also a play on darkness and light in the Vulteius episode

39. Cf. Leigh 1997, 182–83 and Eldred 2002.
40. Cf. Maltby 1991, 657 for *vultus-velle* and Henderson 1987, 139.
41. On this pun cf. Eldred 2002, 60 and Henderson 1987, 139.

with the word *lux* being used to denote both daylight and life.[42] Indeed daylight plays an important role in structuring this passage: while nightfall interrupts the fighting (*pacemque habuere tenebrae* "darkness brought on peace," *BC* 4.473), daybreak lets it resume again (*BC* 4.529). Finally, the passage's theatricality has invited analysis of the Vulteius episode as a *naumachia*, which places the *Opitergii* in a natural theater and turns the raft into a stage.[43]

Food and Drink

A further topos that plays a major role in Caesar's *Commentarii* and is taken over and illustrated in gory detail by Lucan is that of lack of food or drink. Indeed from time to time this seems the decisive factor in military success and can be identified in many cases as the main motivator of the action, thus surpassing the *nefas* (sacrilege) of killing Romans.[44] Lucan's Caesar is well aware of the functioning of hunger in the struggle for power, as is made clear by his thought: *namque asserit urbes / sola fames* (only famine sets cities free, *BC* 3.56–57). Not only does hunger reign in Caesar's camp at Ilerda (*BC* 4.94) but Caesar also takes advantage of the lack of water in Afranius's camp (*BC* 4.292–336), an episode related just before the Vulteius narrative. Later in this very episode hunger will offer its services, too. In the sentence *auxilium fecere famem* (they make their hunger help them, *BC* 4.308) *auxilium* could even be read as the military term "auxiliary troops." At the end of the Afranius episode Lucan seizes the opportunity to make hunger the theme for a short moral treatise calling for moderation. The generically rather low-grade topos of food and drink, at home in comedy or satire, has here been built up to the dimensions of epic.[45]

At the very beginning of the Vulteius episode we witness a variation on the unquenchable thirst of Afranius's troops earlier in *BC* 4: the conquest of Antonius's army by insatiable hunger: *si sola recedat, /* ***expugnat quae tuta,*** *fames* (secure from war's attack if only famine would recede, *BC* 4.409–10). In contrast to other passages in both Caesar and Lucan, here hunger does not

42. Cf. Saylor 1990. Cf. *vicino cum* ***lux*** *altissima Cancro est* (when the sunlight is highest and Cancer near. *BC* 4.527) and *stabat devota iuventus / damnata iam* ***luce*** *ferox* (determined to die, the soldiers stood with life already renounced, fierce, *BC* 4.533–34).

43. Cf. Leigh 1997, 259 on *BC* 4.492–95.

44. Cf. Caes. *Civ.* 1.48–52 esp. 52, Caesar's lack of food because of flood. Cf. *Civ.* 1.71, 78, 81, 84 for Afranius's lack of water. Cf. further *Civ.* 3.47 and 49, where Caesarian soldiers are willing to live on bark from the trees in order to succeed, while at the same time the Pompeians are short of water as Caesar has built dykes to block their water supplies.

45. Gowers 1993, 2–8 points to literary inhibitions to describe food.

bring with it narrative closure but rather the opposite. For the rafts have to be sent from the mainland to help Antonius's troops to escape—not from the pressing enemy but from hunger. Hunger thus initiates a story line not unlike its Ovidian counterpart—we remember the impressive personification of *Fames* in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 8, which infects Erysichthon with deathly hunger.

Fortuna

Fortuna is a further agent in Caesar's narrative who features large in Lucan's epic as well: *ac se* ***Fortuna*** *inclinaverat* (and Fortune had so tipped the scales, *Civ.* 1.52.3) is where she appears first. In Caesar's characteristically terse account the use of an abstract noun as *persona agens* seems noteworthy and prompts a commentator to speak of "the idea of an active power whose wishes change things."[46] Fortune is clearly a prominent feature in Caesar's narrative. Consequently in Lucan's hyperbolic opus she is of even greater prominence—I count 146 instances of *fortuna.* In the search for gods (or similar) in Lucan's godless epic the role of Fortuna has attracted much attention.[47] Watching Caesar battling the über-storm in *Bellum Civile* 5 confirms the notion that in Lucan's epic Fortune usually sides with Caesar (*BC* 5.654–671). Nevertheless both the Vulteius and the succeeding Curio episode in *BC* 4 are portrayed as adverse blows of fortune for Caesar, as highlighted already in their very first lines (*BC* 4.402–3 and 4.513–14). Moreover there are eight instances of *fatum* in the Vulteius episode, all but one employed in the sense of death, a stark contrast to what *fatum* usually denotes in less gloomy epics such as Virgil's *Aeneid.*[48] Accordingly the apparent futility of all human concerns in Lucan's world driven by *Fortuna* and *Fatum* opens up Vulteius's story to a nihilistic reading. It remains to be seen, however, whether this passage invites such a view or whether it nevertheless displays traces of poetic self-consciousness or ideology.

46. Cf. Carter 1993 *ad Civ.* 1.52.3. Further instances can be found in *celeriter fortuna mutatur* (fortune swiftly changed, *Civ.* 1.59.1); *cur denique fortunam periclitaretur* (and why should he tempt fate? *Civ* 1.72.2); *hic subitam commutationem fortunae videre licuit* (and now a sudden change of fortune could be observed, *Civ.* 3.27.1); *sed fortuna, quae plurimum potest cum in reliquis rebus tum praecipue in bello, parvis momentis magnas rerum commutationes efficit;* (but luck, universally powerful but particularly so in war, brings about great changes of circumstance by slight adjustments of her balance, *Civ* 3.68.1), and especially *ut ipsa fortuna illum obicere Pompeio videretur* (so that fortune herself seems to be putting him [Domitius] in Pompey's path, *Civ* 3.79.3).

47. Cf. Le Bonniec 1970, 173–74 and Williams 1978, 264.

48. Cf. Thompson and Bruère 1970, 165 n. 22. The exception is *BC* 4.514.

The Raft

In typical Lucanian synecdochic style we have found that the Vulteius episode stands *pars pro toto* for the whole civil war and that it forms a *mise en abyme* of the entire epic as it includes, mirrors, and retells many of its main issues. It features its own epilogue and asserts its uniqueness with the statement *pietas ferientibus una / **non repetisse fuit*** (the single duty of those who strike was not to repeat themselves, *BC* 4.565–66). The Vulteius episode thus even has its own sense of closure in a world of endless repetition.

Lucan likes tableaux, likes to place his characters and usually puts them on a carefully prepared stage.[49] In the Vulteius episode, then, we find ekphrasis of landscape (*BC* 4.455–61) and the place where the raft is captured has long been recognized as a *locus horribilis*, which subverts elements of Virgil's Carthaginian bay and leads the reader to expect no good.[50] Lucan associates the two parties of the civil war with the elements of land and sea, assigning land to Caesar and sea to Pompey as the elements that side with them. Caesar thus crosses the Alps with ease but is threatened by rivers, while the sea favors Pompey at Brundisium.[51] The cliffs the raft is caught at, however, do not really fit into either category, as they combine elements of both land and sea.[52] Even though, following the rule outlined above, the reader expects a Pompeian victory because we are confronted with Caesarians on a water vessel, this setting makes us aware that the outcome of the conflict may not prove as clear-cut as one would expect; a surprise is in the offing. As I have indicated earlier, the fabrication of the rafts will give us some indication of how this passage is asking to be read.

While the Cilicians stick to their traditional guile, the project of building the rafts is described as *nova furta . . . exquisita* (a new trick was sought, *BC* 4.416).[53] The word *furtum*, however, can also bear the sense of literary theft and plagiarism (OLD 1c), a meaning that certainly catches the attention of readers alive to the poetics of repetition. This construction—so we are told—will not be

---

49. Cf. chapter 2 on Erictho and Thessaly. Masters 1992, 150–78 on the Thessalian excursus has illuminated the important role played by Lucan's descriptions and excursus on landscape in this process.

50. Cf. Thompson and Bruère 1970, 165.

51. Schönberger 1960 gives some examples.

52. Cf. *impendent cava **saxa mari*** (hollow rocks hang over the sea, *BC* 4.455); ***silvis aequor** inumbrat* (with forests it [rock] overshadows the water, *BC* 4.456) and the water-filled caves: *cavernae / evomuere fretum* (caverns spew out water, *BC* 4.460).

53. Cf. also *at Pompeianus fraudes innectere ponto / antiqua parat arte Cilix* (but Pompeius's Cilicians with their skill of old prepare to weave stratagems in the sea, *BC* 4.448–49), a verse that as Sklenar 2003, 26 has observed exudes a certain irony as the Cilicians were renowned pirates in Roman historical memory and it was precisely Pompey who stopped this activity.

what we expect: *neque enim de more* . . . (they do not follow custom, *BC* 4.417). The ship's building material will be used in an unusual way (*sed firma gerendis / molibus insolito contexunt robora ductu* "but in a strange line they link together timber to carry a great bulk," *BC* 4.418–19). The phrase *insolito . . . ductu* (*BC* 4.419) becomes even more conspicuous if one considers the use of *ductus* as a rhetorical term for structure, employed as such by Quintilian (*Inst.* 4.2.53 and 9.4.30). The term even appears in the Epitaphium Lucani (*poet. minores* V 74, 3) characterizing his writing style: *continuo numquam derexi carmina* ***ductu,*** *quae tractim serpant: plus mihi comma placet* (I have never written the verses in continuous flow to creep along draggingly: I prefer the short phrase, trans. J. A. Crook).[54] In addition the verb *contexere* (*contexunt*, *BC* 4.419), usually employed for "joining timbers together," also denotes composing writings and weaving texts: OLD 1 + 2 provides (amusingly) the example *Caesaris . . . commentarios . . . contexui* (I have joined together Caaesar's commentarii, Hirt. *Gal.* 8.pr.2). Furthermore, the timbers used here are of special strength (*firma . . . robora*, *BC* 4.418–19). Again the word *robur* that appears here is no poetically innocent term, but often serves in Lucan as a metaphor for the literary tradition.[55] And even the word *moles* (*molibus*, *BC* 4.419) boasts remarkable versatility. It can denote substructures for a defensive structure (*moles*, OLD 3b), a large crowd of people (OLD 1), or simply an "epic" undertaking or enterprise (OLD 6). The raft's building process thus brims with metaliterary vocabulary suggestive of the composition of a work of literature.

Fama

This leads us to the second, much discussed aspect of this passage's exemplarity, that of virtue and its resulting fame. Vulteius lures his soldiers into suicide with the promise that this action will turn into a memorable exemplum, a lasting monument surpassing those of the past.

> *nescio quod nostris magnum et memorabile fatis*
> ***exemplum,*** *Fortuna, paras. quaecumque per aevum*
> *exhibuit* ***monimenta*** *fides servataque ferro*
> *militiae pietas, transisset nostra iuventus.*

54. Cf. the definition by C. Chirius Fortunatianus (probably 4th century AD), *Ars rhetorica* 1.5 *quid est* ***ductus****? Quo modo tota causa agenda sit.* (What is ductus? The way in which the entire case is treated).

55. Masters 1992, 27 and 29 with n. 44; Leigh 1999 on the philosophical implications of this building material.

> [In our fate, Fortune, you intend some great and memorable example. All the records that loyalty and the soldier's duty observed by the sword have shown throughout the ages, our army could have surpassed.] (*BC* 4.496–99)

The desire to gain fame lies behind the desire to be seen and to have both armies (and even Caesar, if only this were possible) as witnesses. Accordingly in his speech Vulteius constantly reassures his troops of their audience: *in conspicua* (in the open, *BC* 4.492), *praebebunt testes* (we have been seen, *BC* 4.493), *spectabunt* (they will watch, *BC* 4.495); and at the end of the passage, Lucan can trumpet this raft's fame: *nullam maiore locuta est / ore ratem totum discurrens Fama per orbem* (Fame running through all the world spoke of no raft with a louder voice, *BC* 4.573–74).

Again let me point to Caesarian precedents. Caesar lists renown as one of the causes of the conflict between him and Pompey. Pompey envies the fame of the Caesar (*invidia atque obtrectatione laudis suae* "he twisted his judgment from malice and jealousy of his own renown," *Civ.* 1.7.1). Soon thereafter Caesar emphasizes his desire to harm Pompey's reputation: *tertio ut auctoritatem qua ille maxime apud exteras nationes niti videbatur minueret, cum **fama** per orbem terrarum percrebruisset illum a Caesare obsideri neque audere proelio dimicare* (and third to undermine the authority that his opponent [Pompey] seemed to enjoy, especially with foreign nations, when the whole world came to hear that he was under siege from Caesar and did not dare to fight him on the field of battle, *Civ.* 3.43.3).

The primacy of his own fame and reputation is of the utmost importance for Caesar: *sibi semper primam fuisse dignitatem vitaque potiorem* (indirect speech: "For himself [Caesar said] his standing had always been the leading consideration, more important than his life," *Civ.* 1.9.2). The significance of both fame and rumor can be seen from further examples: rumor management is particularly effective for improving Caesar's situation: *multa rumore fingebant, ut paene bellum confectum videretur* (They invented much by way of rumor, so that the war seemed practically over, *Civ.* 1.53.1).[56] There are even cases in which rumor takes over a leading role in the plot and plays a vital part in conducting the war.[57] When the Pompeians spread the *fama* of their victory at Dyrrachium, Caesar runs into considerable difficulties: ***fama** percrebruerat pulsum fugere*

56. Cf. also *extinctis rumoribus* "with the rumors scotched" (*Civ.* 1.60.5).

57. Cf. *nuntiatum est adesse Scipionem cum legionibus, magna opinione et **fama** omnium; nam plerumque in novitate [rem] fama antecedit* (there came the news, accompanied by much rumor and general speculation, that Scipio and his legions were near; for when some new development occurs, in most cases rumor outruns the fact, *Civ.* 3.36.1).

Caesarem paene omnibus copiis amissis. haec itinera infesta reddiderat, haec civitates nonnullas ab eius amicitia avertebat (and a wildly exaggerated rumor had spread, that Caesar had been routed and was fleeing with the loss of nearly all his men. This news had not only made the journey dangerous, but was even turning some communities against him, *Civ.* 3.79.4).[58] It takes Caesar a while to catch up with *fama* who had preceded him (*sed eo* ***fama*** *iam praecurrerat* "but he was preceded there by rumor," *Civ.* 3.80.2). But soon enough he manages to outrun her: *et [Caesar] Metropolim venit, sic ut nuntios expugnati oppidi* ***famam****que antecederet* (Caesar came to Metropolis, so that he arrived there before the news or the rumor of [Gomphi's] storming, *Civ.* 3.80.7). In the end he is even able to counter the false rumors spread about him.[59] After Pharsalus, however, it will be Pompey who is haunted by rumors about Caesar's imminent arrival (*BC* 3.102.8). Last but not least, as Caesar's *clementia* toward the Massilians demonstrates, reputation can be of much use even for those who have been defeated: *Caesar magis eos pro* ***nomine*** *et vetustate quam pro meritis in se civitatis conservans* (Caesar spared them, more in accordance with the fame and antiquity of their state than with what they deserved of himself, *Civ.* 2.22.6). As we have seen from my brief survey, there are already multiple facets and aspects of *fama* inherent in Caesar's account, many of which Lucan employs in the wider scope of his epos as well, as we have seen in chapter 2.

The death of Vulteius and his men seems a distortion of the idea of *devotio*, the quasi-sacrificial death of the one for the many that Roman history and the *Aeneid* glorify. In Vulteius's case this is turned into the death of the many for one. Moreover this "one" is not the charismatic leader of the raft but rather the overarching leader, Caesar. It has been argued that through the lack of naming and individuality given to the men in their death their glory is confined to the epilogue of the passage and that thus their attempt to become an exemplum has failed. According to this reading Lucan's reassurance of fame would be deeply ironic.[60]

This interpretation, however, misses out on the rhetoric embodied in this passage, composed with insistent emphasis on repetition. Vulteius speaks to his men but also to us; and, as Quintilian reassures us, he continues to do so when his speech becomes the topos of many *suasoriae*, rhetorical showpieces that

58. Cf. also *per orbem terrarum* ***fama*** *ac litteris victoriam eius diei concelebrabant* (they made that day's victory famous, by letter and by word of mouth, to the whole world, *Civ.* 3.72.4).

59. Cf. *isdem permoti* ***rumoribus,*** *portas clauserunt— . . . cognito ex captivis—portas aperuerunt* (being swayed by the same rumors, they shut their gates . . . when they heard [of the fate of Gomphi] from prisoners . . . they opened the gates, *Civ.* 3.81.1).

60. Eldred 2002, 72 and 76 with n. 38.

give imaginary advice.[61] For Vulteius's men, the *Opitergini*, succeed in becoming an exemplum—in rhetorical handbooks at least.[62] We might even assume that the *Opitergini* had already found their way into the rhetorical schools in Lucan's time. Moreover the tax relief the city of Opitergium received in their honor from Caesar, together with Livy's account of their deeds, will have helped to keep their memory alive. The speech of Vulteius can thus be read as a rhetorical exercise, with the audience well aware of its role as a typical exemplum—in both the moral and the rhetorical sense.

What is more, there are parallels between the preceding Petreius scene and the Vulteius episode.[63] Both leaders face similar situations and both influence the motivation of their troops with a fiery speech. Thus the two parties, the Pompeians under Petreius and the Caesarians under Vulteius, serve as exempla of opposing positions. While one side chooses to surrender and is then allowed to live a peaceful life outside the Roman army (*BC* 4.383–85), the other opts for (Stoic) self-disembodiment lest it be absorbed by the enemy's military body. They are keen to keep their identity, so that their fame may not disappear, absorbed by and merged with Pompey's army. We know from our sources that the rest of Antonius's army, which Vulteius's men are part of, surrenders in the end—it is subsumed within the Pompeian army and must fight for the other side: *his Antonianos milites admiscuerat* (with these [soldiers] he had mixed the soldiers who had been serving with Antonius, Caes. *Civ.* 3.4.2). Accordingly one might take Vulteius's raft as a quasi-funereal pyre on which the men have thrown themselves willingly in a repetition of the Herculean idea of constructing one's own pyre and dying in dignity as long doing so is still possible (*BC* 2.157–58).

One question scholarship has focused on is whether Vulteius's men win fame through virtue or eventually fail to display real virtue. Repeatedly the argument has been brought forward that the passion of *furor* (anger) taints Vulteius's men's Stoic virtue, and that their attempt to gain virtue is thus ultimately

61. Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.23 in a passage on deliberation: *ita propter id ipsum non est necesse, quia perire potius licet; denique non fecerunt Saguntini nec in rate* ***Opitergini*** *circumventi* (the situation itself does not make surrender "necessary," because it is open to them to die. To clinch the point, the Saguntines did not surrender, nor did the men from Opitergium who were surrounded on the raft); and especially *Inst.* 3.8.30: *Saepe vero et utilitatem despiciendam esse dicimus ut honesta faciamus . . . (ut cum illis* ***Opiterginis damus consilium*** *ne se hostibus dedant, quamquam perituri sint nisi fecerint* (Often indeed we say that expediency must be spurned, so that we can act honorably [as for instance when we advise the men of Opitergium not to surrender, though they will die unless they do so]).

62. For an exemplum used as a rhetorical term cf. Cic. *Inv.* 1.49 and Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.1.

63. Radicke 2004, 294.

doomed.[64] Lucan, however, need not be aiming to design a coherent philosophical system in his epic, but rather follows the logic of civil war.[65] I would like to suggest, following Fantham's proposal, that we read Caesar "as the actual representative and embodiment of the divine anger which overthrew the Roman Republic and the liberty of its elite."[66] The phrase *furor est* (*BC* 4.517) would then provide a clear marker that the inspiration for suicide is loyalty to Caesar, the divine anger, for he provides the men's identity, as their *dux* (leader).[67] By taking on board the ultimate emotion of civil war, *furor*, the men of Vulteius themselves become part of the civil war and thus follow a different though perhaps unheroic code.[68] As far as the question of virtue is concerned, both sides employ *fraudes* or *furta* (tricks) in the first instance, which may already indicate that they are not following the usual path toward glory.[69] In the end, however, as we have noted, *fama* will praise not the men but the raft, which as we have seen is a metaphor for Lucan's poetic production (*BC* 4.573–74, quoted above). It is thereby ultimately the poet who earns fame in and with this passage, not the men.

Repetition

To conclude and to return to the leitmotif of repetition, I shall continue with some more general thoughts and make a bold suggestion about Lucan's language. Critics have repeatedly noted "offensive repetitions" and a "pointless redundancy of expression" in Lucan's epic style and even accused him of "a general lack of care" and go on to note "the more casual repetitions in the commentary."[70] Suggestions as to why these occur seem not entirely satisfactory: "It may be that Lucan was insensitive in an unusual degree to repetition; but it seems more likely that it was haste of composition in a refined medium that led to unwelcome echoes."[71] Goreman, however, shows how Lucan pounds

64. Cf. Eldred 2002, 79; Goreman 2001, 280; Esposito 2001, 39.

65. Cf. Fantham 1992a, 12 on Lucan: "Young men usually have more immediate interests than philosophy and few problems that require its assistance."

66. Fantham 2003, 249.

67. Only after their death are Vulteius's men released (cf. *remittere*, *BC* 4.571 and OLD 6 for *remittere* as releasing an army).

68. Only at Pharsalus does war turn into *rabies*.

69. Cf. Sklenar 2003, 28. He argues that this constructs a moral balance between Caesarians and Pompeians.

70. Mayer 1981, 13. Cf. also the lists of "careless" repetitions in Heitland's introduction to Haskins 1887, lxxxi–lxxxiv.

71. Mayer 1981, 13. Sometimes, however Lucan's repetition is part of a greater scheme: Lucan

the same note by listing examples of his exuberant and repetitive use of body imagery in the slaughter scene of the Vulteius episode (*BC* 4.540–73).[72] Moreover there are even more instances of repetition, in many cases of words embodying key concepts of the passage: *exemplum* (497, 575), *dux* (466, 540), *virtus* (470, 491, 512, 558, 576, 581), *fama* (509, 574), *lux* (447, 473, 483, 527, 534, 568), *ratis* (420, 430, 434, 446, 453, 457, 466, 471, 507, 571, 574), *mors* (479, 491, 506, 509, 517, 533, 538, 557, 558, 570, 580). One could argue that Lucan simply knows how to drive home his point (repeatedly).[73]

We might, however, also elevate this feature to a conscious dogma of Lucan's style (*Stilprinzip*). Wills in his book on repetition in Latin poetry directs attention toward repetition in Lucan used meticulously and to great effect.[74] However, these examples fall under the category of "figured" repetition, syntactic and positional structures that we readily accept as *figures* of repetition, commonly understood as conveying some deeper meaning. Contrariwise, Wills points in his epilogue to the phenomenon of "unfigured" repetition: "'unfigured' for us in our own poetic, or in our knowledge of ancient poetics."[75] In a final footnote he goes on to suggest: "In a more diffuse way, apparently irregular repetitions may play a role as recurrent images which contribute to the articulation and development of theme in a play or epic. [. . .] perhaps it should be seen as a condensed use of *formula* or *leitmotiv*."[76] Schönberger provides a valuable account of the workings of leitmotifs in Lucan and the refined techniques of variation the poet applies. He demonstrates how Lucan connects the threefold depiction of Pompey's floating corpse only through the threefold repetition of the word *truncus* while varying the other elements of that image: ***truncus****que . . . iactatur aquis* (the corpse is tossed by the water, *BC* 8.698–99); *aequore* ***truncus*** */ conspicitur* (the corpse is visible in the water, *BC* 8.721–22), *ad* ***truncum,*** *qui fluctu paene relatus . . . pendebat* (. . . to the corpse, which, almost

connects Marius's and Sulla's bloodshed by recurring vocabulary. Cf. the analysis of Paratore 1992, 28.

72. Cf. Goreman 2001, 282: *dextra* (hand), *BC* 4.542, 559; *manus* (hand), 460, 562; *viscera* (entrails), 545, 566; *vulnera* (wound) 543, 546, 551, 559, *cruor/cruentus* (blood) 567, 570.

73. Similarly Paratore 1992, 34 lists all instances of repetition with which Lucan hammers home the fact that Antaeus regains strength from the earth ("Su questo batte il breve spunto lucaneo con tipiche iterazioni di parole"): *vires*, *BC* 4.598, 636, 604; *tetigere parentem*, 4.599, *contingere matrem*, 4.615, *tactae . . . parentis*, 4.645.

74. Cf. Wills 1996, 220–21 on *fratribus incurrunt fratres* (brothers attack brothers, *BC* 4.563) where the repetition represents equivalent combatants; on *BC* 4.556–59, where a polyptoton of *mors* (death) is flanked by two lots of falling youth, and the repetition of *dux* (leader) in *BC* 4.572–73 *ducibus mirantibus ulli / esse ducem tanti.*

75. Wills 1996, 475.

76. Wills 1996, 477 n. 14 (my emphasis).

carried off by the waves, was hanging [on the edge of the shore], *BC* 8.753–54).[77] In this vein I suggest that Lucan's constant repetition serves to point to key concepts in specific passages or the entire epic, while simultaneously it may be perceived as a leitmotif that points to the poetics of repetition in civil war and as symptomatic of Lucan's awareness of his role as epic successor.

Repetition and Endings

Direct verbal repetition apart, in the epic texture the adverbs *iterum* and *rursus* (again/repeatedly) function as clear indicators of Lucan's poetics of repetition. As we have seen, these two words frequently serve Lucan in the *Bellum Civile* as markers of programmatic reiteration: the return to chaos and the prophecy of the *matrona furens* in *Bellum Civile* 1, as well as the frame of the old man's speech in *Bellum Civile* 2, all sport this feature. And already in the *Aeneid* the *iterum . . . iterum* of the Sibyl of Cumae predicts that the Trojans will have to fight the Trojan War all over again: *causa mali tanti coniunx* ***iterum*** *hospita Teucris / externique* ***iterum*** *thalami* (The cause of all this Trojan woe is again an alien bride, again a foreign marriage! *Aen.* 6.93–94).[78] Lucan, too, does not tire of pointing out that we witness repeats and that the factions rise once more. The *matrona furens* thus sees the factions rise again and makes her virtual journey through the world repeatedly: *consurgunt partes* ***iterum,*** *totumque per orbem /* ***rursus*** *eo* (*BC* 1.692–93). This notion of a second, reiterated fight is expressed at many junctures: in *BC* 4 superhero Hercules has to seize giant Antaeus a second time (*iterum*) and repeats their fight (*BC* 4.640–42) and Lucan fills out the silence of the Delphic oracle with a reference to a second tyrannicidal Brutus as murderer of Caesar: *vindicis an gladii facinus poenasque furorum / regnaque ad ultores* ***iterum*** *redeuntia Brutos, / ut peragat fortuna, taces?* (Are you silent on the deed of the avenging sword, the punishments of madness and tyranny again returning to vengeance of the Bruti, to enable Fortune to perform them? *BC* 5.206–8). Consequently we are not surprised when the battle at Pharsalus is fashioned as a second Gigantomachy (*iterum*), a repeat of the fight between gods and giants (*BC* 7.144–48). In addition Pompey could easily resummon his forces and launch a further battle, a second Pharsalus: *cunctas impellere gentes /* ***rursus*** *in arma potes* ***rursus****que in fata redire* (you [Pompey] could again impel to war all the nations and again return to your former fortune, *BC* 7.717–19). This constant doubling culminates in a cameo at the epic's very end when

77. Cf. Schönberger 1961, 31–36.
78. Quint 1989, 33.

Caesar himself is subject to repeated attacks (*nam **rursus** in arma / auspiciis Ganymedis eunt ac multa secundo / proelia Marte gerunt* "again they go to fight, now under the command of Ganymedes [and not Achillas any more] and wage many battles with success," *BC* 10.530–32) Here repetition has become self-propelled: war will go on despite the fact that its instigator Achillas has been cut out. Shortly before the text's abrupt end Lucan spells out repetition, one of the epic's formative concepts. We as readers are left to ponder Lucan's key issues now that the narrative has subsided.[79]

Throughout the epic we encounter reiteration on a smaller scale as well. Consequently not only tree trunks in the Massilian grove fall and rise again (*iterum*, *BC* 3.417–19) but human bodies, too, are resummoned for necromancy by Erictho. As the witch is the epic's most powerful character, only she has the power to promises closure in death. As reward for his service she promises eternal rest to the reawakened corpse: *sit tanti vixisse **iterum:** nec verba nec herbae / audebunt longae somnum tibi solvere Lethes / a me morte data* (Think this worth the cost of a second life: neither words nor drugs will dare destroy your sleep of lengthy Lethe, once death is given by me, *BC* 6.768–70). Repetition is even written into the epic landscape on both geographical and cosmic level as rivers such as the Tigris are born again from a new source (*BC* 3.261–63), stars move in circles, and Libra swings always back into balance (*BC* 4.58–59). Lucan also extends his program of repetition to the political and textual body. Accordingly Pompey is shown *re*assembling the senate at Epirus. Here Lucan's unmaking of Rome reverses Aeneas's progress from Buthrotum toward future Rome as told by Virgil in *Aeneid* 3.[80] The reader feels *Aeneid* 3 shining through when Lucan draws attention to the repetition by piling *rursus* onto *redeunt*: *omnia **rursus** / membra loco redeunt* (now all the limbs return to their place again [note the body imagery], *BC* 5.36). What is more, a second senate meeting looms ahead in *Bellum Civile* 8, a direct repetition of the earlier scene.[81] Lucan has a habit of scattering motifs and morsels of information around his epic, which gain their full significance only at one specific point.[82] One example of this technique is the frequent resounding of the Cilicians' reputation for being pirates (*BC* 3.228, 8.257–56), which comes to full bloom at this theme's last occurrence, when Cato scorns the Cilician Tarcondimotus by accusing him of reverting to being a pirate: *o numquam pacate Cilix, **iterum**ne rapinas / vadis in aequoreas?* (O Cilician, never pacified, again do you proceed to plunder on the seas? *BC*

79. Masters 1992, 247–59 defends the epilogue as it stands as the epic's end Lucan intended and thus reads it as the author's final contribution to the epic's discourses.

80. Cf. Rossi 2000, 579–83 on the reversed journeys of Aeneas and Pompey.

81. Schönberger 1961, 91–92 analyzes how these two scenes are connected by leitmotifs.

82. Schrijvers 1989 points to Lucan's technique of autointerpretation on a larger scale.

9.222–23). Lucan here relies on the reader to be acquainted with this topos at this point as no further explanation is offered.

Another figure immersed in repetition is Pompey's wife, Cornelia. She is his second wife, and is left behind by him twice, first on Lesbos and then at the shores of Egypt: ***iterum**ne relinquor, / Thessalicis summota malis?* (Am I deserted a second time, kept away from Thessaly's disaster? *BC* 8.584–85). Repetition will become her role, as she reiterates mourning for Pompey wherever she appears. After his murder this becomes her life: *sed magis, ut visa est lacrimis exhausta solutas / in vultus effusa comas, Cornelia puppe / egrediens, **rursus** geminato verbere plangent* (but when Cornelia was seen, as she left the ship, worn out by tears, with loosened tresses spread across her face, still more they wail, their blows again redoubling, *BC* 9.171–73).[83]

Apart from Erictho the only character in the epic able to break through the rings of repetition is Caesar, who manages to escape the endless up and down of the über-storm in *BC* 5 when a wave sets him on land rather than "casting him down from the sea's high heap": ***nec rursus** ab alto / aggere deiecit pelagi* (*BC* 5.673–74). Not only will Caesar push things further by instituting a new form of government, but he even assumes ascendancy over time. According to Roman practice Caesar as consul lends his name to the year of the battle of Pharsalus (*BC* 5.391–92). This tradition comes close to being meaningless once the *princeps* is installed and the consuls are reduced to mere shadows of a name: *tantum careat ne nomine tempus / menstruus in fastos distinguit saecula consul* (except to prevent time lacking a name, consuls for a month mark out the ages in the calendar, *BC* 5.398–99). Caesar's calendar reform will reempower time again and writes his own name into the months of every year—till kingdom come.[84]

Stepping back from my examples, let me introduce more general considerations about the logic of repetition in Lucan and start with looking at repetition in some of Lucan's epic predecessors. In his examination of the *Aeneid* Quint differentiates between negative and positive repetition. The former manifests itself in "an obsessive circular return to a traumatic past," through the repeatedly failing attempts to found new versions or replicas of Troy.[85] The latter is the rerun of the Trojan War as a war against the native Latins. What makes it positive is that this is a repeat "*with a difference*."[86] This time around, the Trojans

83. Keith 2008, 236–53 traces Cornelia's lament throughout the epic.

84. Caesar even announces his powerful plans: *media inter proelia semper / stellarum caelique plagis superisque vacavi, / nec meus Eudoxi vincetur fastibus annus* (always in the midst of battles I found time for higher things, for regions of the stars and sky, nor will my own year be worsted by Eudoxus's calendar, *BC* 10.185–87). Cf. Feeney 2007 on aspects of Caesar's calendar and Schmidt 2005, 331 for the dissolution of time in Seneca's tragedies.

85. Quint 1989, 10.

86. Quint 1989, 10. I reproduce Quint's highlighting.

will be the winners; we set sail toward Rome and fall into line with Virgilian teleology. In contrast, Lucan takes negative repetition to the extreme in endless circles of civil war.

Ovid's penchant for self-repetition makes him repeat himself internally within a work and also finds him reusing material from earlier works, so that he becomes his own continuator.[87] This helps Ovid to connect and unify his poetic corpus. Lucan follows Ovid's example when repeating himself internally to bind his fragmented epic together. Repetition is here deliberately harnessed in structuring the epic text. *Bellum Civile* 9, for example, gains much of its structural coherence from repeatedly returning to the motif of Cato's *virtus*.[88]

The reader, however, is left to ponder whether Lucan's lack of teleology leaves us caught in the endless repetition of civil war, or better whether Lucan's teleology must depend at least in part on the viewpoint of his audiences, implied or actual. On the *Aeneid* Quint observes: "The victors experience history as a coherent, end-directed story told by their own power; the losers experience a contingency that they are powerless to shape to their own ends."[89] For the *Bellum Civile* this means that some may perceive it as a narrative that leads straight to the reign of Nero as announced by the author at the beginning. Others, however, may get lost in a degrading, disconcerting, depressing labyrinth of repetitious cycles of violence.[90]

Nevertheless, to the modern reader's surprise, we also find readings of Lucan that are far from complaining about Lucan's lack of closure. Some, as we shall see, simply create their own ending in order to come to terms with the epic's end as it is transmitted. Others seek more radical solutions by restructuring: the middle-Irish translation of Lucan, *In Cath Catharda*, breaks off after the battle of Pharsalus.[91] If, however, we collect together the medieval *argumenta* of the *Bellum Civile*, which for centuries flanked the reader's entry to each of its books, and if we then assemble these to form one continuous line, they form a coherent account, and succeed in creating the impression of a continuous narrative. Moreover this very short history of the civil war (as told by Lucan) is studded with line endings from the *Bellum Civile* (as marked below), rooting itself firmly in Lucan's text. Above all, as we shall see, it provides its own interpretation of how the epic ends.

---

87. Wheeler 2000, 11.

88. Schönberger 1961, 39.

89. Quint 1993, 9.

90. Henderson 1998c, 125–26 thinks about a Roman dispute whether the civil war between Caesar and Pompey ever ended at all, i.e., was separated from the second-triumvirate-through-to-Actium war.

91. Cf. Harris 1998, ch. 5. Mayer 1981, 26 n. 2 proposes a lack of interest in what follows on the translator's side as the reason for this end point.

ARGUMENTA LUCANI

1.

Proponit primus liber, invehit, invocat atque
exponit causas, cursus properantis ad urbem
Caesaris et nimios hic narrat in urbe timores.

[The first book sets out the subject, rebukes, invokes, and sets out the causes and the onset of Caesar as he hastens to the City, and relates the overreaction of the City.]

2.

Quadruplices questus libri pars prima secundi
continet; eiusdem pars proxima verba Catonis
et Bruti. dicit, quo foedere Martia nupsit.
hostis in occursum ducit pars tertia; Magnum
opposuisse manus notat et quod ***Caesaris ira***
cuncta ruunt. arcesque capit, ***cedentibus instat.***
ast uni vitam tribuit qui nuntius hosti,
exemplumque fuit; quo viso Magnus ad omnes
turmas ipse suas hortandas magna minatur.
hinc pars quarta notat Pompeium tunc properasse
Brundisium; tandemque videns maris ostia claudi
Hesperiam puppesque duas in parte reliquit.

[The first part of the second book contains four laments; the second part tells the words of Cato and Brutus. It tells by what pact Martia (i.e., Marcia) was wedded. The third part leads us to the coming together of the enemy, notes that Magnus set up his opposing force, and that at the wrath of Caesar there was total commotion (ruinous collapse). He captures the fortresses and presses upon the withdrawing enemy. But he spared the life of one man, who went and told the foe and was an example: beholding which, Magnus goes round all his troops exhorting them and threatening mightily. The fourth part tells us how Pompey then hurried to Brundisium, and finally, seeing the portals of the sea were closed, he abandoned Hesperia, leaving two vessels behind.]

3.

Tertius exponit primo quid Iulia dixit,
quid Magnus fecit, audax quo Curio missus.
altera pars libri dicit, quod Caesar ***in urbem***

ivit opesque dedit Romae nolente Metello
militibus, Magnique notat qui signa sequuntur.
ultima quod tendens Hispanas Caesar ad oras
Massiliae stetit: hanc sed vicit in aequore Brutus.

[The third book describes, first, what Julia said, what Magnus did, whither bold Curio was sent. The other half of the book tells how Caesar proceeded to the City and handed the treasure to the troops at Rome against the will of Metellus and notes who followed the standards of Magnus Pompey. The last part tells how Caesar on the way to the shores of Spain stopped at Massilia, but Brutus defeated this city at sea.]

4.
At quarti libri narrat pars prima, quod ivit
Caesar in Hispanos ad iussa ducesque reversos.
mortem Vultei cum multis altera pars dat.
ultima, quod Varum pepulit campoque fugavit
Curio, fraude Iubae cecidit qui ***strage suorum.***

[The first part of book 4 tells how Caesar went against the Spanish who returned to the commands of their generals. The second part gives us the death of Vulteius and many others. The last part has how Curio repelled Varus and chased him from the field, Curio, who fell by the deceit of Juba amid the slaughter of his men.]

5.
In prima quinti Pompeio Roma regenda
est data. multa timens pro se responsa recepit
Appius; exponit pars proxima seditionem
sedatam poena. mare transiit ***urbe relicta***
Caesar, qui questus, quod non Antonius ultra
iverat, expertus fuit ipse pericula ponti.
ultima, quod posita mansit Cornelia Lesbo.

[At the beginning of book 5 Rome is given over to Pompey to rule. Appius fearfully receives many oracles on his own position. Part 2 sets out the mutiny, quelled by punishment. Caesar leaves the City and crosses the sea; and, complaining that Antony has not gone further, himself experiences the perils of the ocean. The last part has how Cornelia stayed put on Lesbos.]

6.
"Postquam castra" notat, quod Caesar victus ab hoste
fugit in Emathiam, quamvis clausisset is ipsum.
Hinc et Thessaliam quae sit gentemque profanam
describit. damnat Sextum non digna petentem.

["Postquam castra" tells how Caesar, worsted by the enemy, fled to Emathia, although he had hemmed them in. Then it describes Thessaly and its godless people. It condemns Sextus for making an ignoble petition.]

7.
"Segnior Oceano" casu quo ***bella geruntur***
ostendit primo, sic et quae dixit uterque.
proxima pars bellum describit, et ultima, Magnum
devictum cepisse fugam. sed Caesar habendas
militibus monstravit opes castrisque recedit.

["Segnior Oceano" first tells for what reason fighting arose, and likewise what both generals said. The next part describes the war and the last part how Magnus, defeated, took flight. But Caesar shows his soldiers the booty they can have and returns to camp.]

8.
"Iam super Herculeas" quo fugit, denotat atque
quid dixit [Magnus] . . . quando quaerere Parthos
consuluit: sed cassa fuit sententia Magni.
Parsque secunda notat Pompeium morte peremptum
indigna; Phariis pars ultima datque sepulcrum.

["I am super Herculeas" relates where Magnus fled to and what he said . . . when he determined to search out the Parthians: but the purpose of Magnus was unfulfilled. The second part tells how Pompey was carried off by an unworthy death, and the last part records his tomb in Egypt.]

9.
"At non in Pharia" dicit, quod bella Catoni
libertate placent, qui Sextum multa minantem
corripuit, postquam scivit de ***funere Magni.***
altera pars multos correptos ***voce Catonis***
dicit per Syrtes fore multa pericula passos.

tertia quod Caesar simulavit ferre dolorem
nec doluit saevus generi ***cervice recisa.***

[“At non in Pharia” tells how war is pleasing to Cato by means of liberty, how he chided Sextus, who was making many threats when he heard of the death of Magnus. The next part tells how the multitude was chided by the voice of Cato and suffered many dangers through the Syrtis. The third part tells how Caesar pretended to bear sorrow but, the sadist, was not sorry to see the severed head of his son-in-law.]

10.
“Ut primum” primo notat ut perrexit ad urbem
Aegypti Caesar et ut est Cleopatra locuta.
et dapibus sumptis Nili disquiritur ortus.
parsque secunda refert famulos qui ***fata parabant***
prava duci caesos adversa nefandaque passos.[92]

[“Ut primum” first tells how Caesar reached the city of Egypt and what Cleopatra said, and at the banquet there was discussion of the source of the Nile. And the second part tells how the underlings who had prepared a wicked fate for the leader were killed, after suffering reverses and unspeakable fates.] (trans. J. A. Crook)

Having followed this account through (as without doubt over the centuries many a student lacking the time to take in the entire epic will have done) we gain the impression of reading a well-rounded story of war, murder, and final revenge. In particular, by focusing the end of this summary on the killing of Achillas and Lucan’s subsequent apostrophe hailing another victim sacrificed to the shade of Pompey (*altera, Magne, tuis iam victima mittitur umbris*, *BC* 10.524), the author of the *argumenta* gives the plot a strong sense of closure. The *argumenta* thus cut out the final 16 verses of the epic and in this version the *Bellum Civile* terminates with a prophetic utterance of the authorial voice predicting the murder of Caesar (*BC* 10.529). What we would miss out on in this reading is the epic’s final spin toward repetition, which, looking back to the Scaeva episode simultaneously, builds up tension and concern for Caesar’s safety.[93] Rossi observes that “the narrative stops abruptly, both creating the im-

92. *Anth.* 806 (*carmina saeculi* xii–xiv), quoted from Riese 1906. For books 2 and 4 there also exist poetic versions; cf. *Anth.* 719c.

93. Rossi 2005, 256–58 explores the ambiguity inherent in the epic’s end. The epic breaks off close to where Caesar’s own account terminates and follows the Homeric model of ending with the name of the antagonist. Cf. Masters 1992, 241 and 258. Moreover, Rossi 2005, 256 suggests reading

pression that the story is interrupted *in medias res* and building a clear expectation for a *sequitur* to come."[94] In the immediate future, outside the scope of the epic we might have witnessed a further *aristeia* of Scaeva, confirming that the *Bellum Civile* is a narrative that moves in circles. For sure, however, once Caesar is murdered by his peers he will become a version of Pompey, another failed *Magnus*, fit closure for Lucan's story.[95] The authorial voice manifests here through its comments on contemporaneous imperial Rome that the murder of Caesar, not unlike the murder of Remus, forms the beginning of yet another story of civil war (*BC* 10.526–29).

It has been suggested that we as readers could, or even should, reduce our focus on the killing of Turnus as the *Aeneid*'s final scene: "the real ending of the story of Rome is found instead in the survey of Roman history on the shield of Aeneas at the end of Book 8."[96] Following this suggestion, the real ending of the *Bellum Civile* would be found in the melee of the battle of Pharsalus, when Lucan's lengthy apostrophes foreshadow the gloomy fate of Imperial Rome (*BC* 7.387–459 and 7.535–43). Accordingly the actual ending of Lucan's epic, which is endowed with the "poetics of the fragmentary text" and an "ideology of timelessness," only "underscores the contradiction of a genre which identifies itself with history and should therefore be endless, but which is simultaneously limited by its need to impart meaning and give closure to the story it tells."[97]

There have been repeated attempts to mend the somewhat unorthodox end of the *Bellum Civile*, which does not meet the conventional expectations of closure.[98] Those who do not simply cut off what disturbs them, or defend the end as it stands, naturally choose to add to the poem, striving for completion. As a result the Renaissance commentator Johannes Sulpicius Verulanus supplemented the abrupt end of the *Bellum Civile* with eleven hexameters. In this version, then, the epic fades out after Caesar's rescue from the immediate danger at the mole:

PHARSALIAE LUCANI APPENDICULA
erexit mentem trepidi tam fortis imago;
et facturus erat memorandi nobile leti
exemplum: sed fata vetant, et fida salutis

echoes of *Remum novos transiluisse muros* ([the story has it] that Remus jumped over the newly built city walls, Liv. 1.7.2) in the final words of the *Bellum Civile*, *calcantem moenia Magnum* (*BC* 10.546), recalling "the brotherly strife that marked the very foundation of the city of Rome."

94. Rossi 2005, 256.

95. Hardie 1997, 140 remarks how "closure as an artistic device imposing completed form on a segment of formless time is sabotaged by the 'real-life' refusal of time to stand still."

96. Hardie 1997, 142.

97. Cf. Hardie 1997, 140–41 for the first two and Rossi 2005, 258 for the third quotation.

98. Fowler 1997, 22 describes the feeling that the "real" ending is not necessarily the one for us.

ostendit Fortuna viam. nam laevus amicas
prospexit puppes, nando quas ausus adire,
ecquid stamus? ait. vel iam per tela fretumque
eripiar: iuguli vel non erit ulla potestas
eunucho concessa mei. tunc puppe relicta
prosilit in pontum. siccos fert laeva libellos,
dextra secat fluctus. tandemque illaesus amico
excipitur plausu clamantis ad aethera turbae.

[So strong an image aroused the spirit of the frightened man, and he was about to give a noble example of a memorable death. But the Fates forbade it, and faithful Fortune showed the path to safety. For on his left he beheld friendly ships, and boldly swam to join them. What do we stay? he cried: either I shall escape, through the weapons and the strait or there shall be no power over my throat granted to the eunuch. Then, leaving the ship, he leaped into the sea. His left hand bore the papers, dry, his right hand cleaves the waves; and at long last, unscathed, he is welcomed with the friendly applause of a crowd clamoring to the heavens.] (trans. J. A. Crook)

As the reader will easily make out, Sulpicius feeds here on one of Lucan's model texts, the *Bellum Alexandrinum.* This "supplement" to Caesar's *commentarii* composed in all likelihood by his secretary Hirtius after the commander's death—we might note this as a parallel with Sulpicius's verses—describes in a short section the battle of Pharos and Caesar's escape by swimming to safety.

Caesar quoad potuit cohortando suos ad pontem ac munitiones continere eodem in periculo uersatus est postquam uniuersos cedere animaduertit in suum nauigium se recepit. quo multitudo hominum insecuta cum inrumperet neque administrandi neque repellendi a terra facultas daretur fore quod accidit suspicatus sese ***ex nauigio eiecit atque ad eas quae longius constiterant naues adnatauit.*** *hinc suis laborantibus subsidio scaphas mittens nonnullos conseruauit*

[A crowd of men followed him, swarming on board and not allowing any opportunity to work the ship and push off from shore. Guessing what was going to happen, he jumped overboard and swam to the ships that had stopped somewhat further away. From here he sent boats to help his men in difficulties, and saved some, while his own ship did indeed sink under the number of soldiers, and was lost along with them.] (*Bellum Alexandrinum* 21)

What is more, Sulpicius also fills in details from the account of this military encounter in Plutarch's *Life of Caesar*:

> . . . and thirdly, when a battle arose at Pharos, he sprang from the mole into a small boat and tried to go to the aid of his men in their struggle, but the Egyptians sailed up against him from every side, so that he threw himself into the sea and with great difficulty escaped by swimming. At this time, too, it is said that he was holding many papers in his hand and would not let them go, though missiles were flying at him and he was immersed in the sea, but held them above water with one hand and swam with the other; his little boat had been sunk at the outset. (Plu. *Caes.* 49.4)

Sulpicius thus remains faithful to history and provides an appropriate closure to this section of the narrative without attempting explicit interpretation.

Continuation of Lucan on a larger scale can be found in Thomas May's *Continuation of the Subiect of Lucan's historicall poem till the death of Iulius Caesar*, first published in 1630.[99] In seven books this man of letters puts into verse what Lucan might have written had he lived. The English version was soon to be followed by a Latin one in hexameters, the *Supplementum Lucani* (1640).[100] In his meticulous examination of the English and the Latin version Bruère establishes that the *Supplementum* repeatedly presents the material of the *Continuation* "pruned, rearranged or amplified."[101] It thus constitutes not only a translation but also a reworking in its own right.

As Thomas May includes Sulpicius's lines among the commendatory verses at the beginning of his *Supplementum Lucani* (1640), Thiel puts forward the suggestion that May initially drew inspiration from these lines and then made the decision to continue the *Bellum Civile* with a more substantial appendix.[102] However, to escape a potentially problematic start for his supplement, May supplies the epic in his 1627 translation with a gesture of closure by appending 50

99. May 1630; a second corrected edition followed three years later (May 1633). On Thomas May's life and work cf. Chester 1932. Norbrook 1994 illuminates May's political and cultural importance. On the reception of Lucan in the English Renaissance cf. Leidig 1975, in the French Baroque cf. Ternaux 2000, on Lucan reception in general cf. the contributions to Walde 2009.

100. First published in Leyden (May 1640), then in London six years later (May 1646); cf. Bruère 1949, 145. We can observe a similar process with Sebastian Brandt's *Das Narrenschiff* (Basel, 1496), whose great success prompted Jacob Locher to release an authorized Latin version in 1497 to make the work accessible to the non-German-speaking humanist intelligentsia.

101. Bruère 1949, 150.

102. Cf. Thiel 1993, 19.

verses to book 10.[103] He thus provides us with an indication of which motifs and themes he deemed prominent enough for inclusion in the epic's epilogue. This compact passage thereby enables us to gain insights into May's reading strategy.

> Th' example rais'd his thoughts, resolved to doe
> What Scaeva did, but straight a scorne to owe
> His valour to examples, checks againe
> That high resolve great thoughts restraine.
> Yet thus at last; Scaeva was mine, 'twas I
> Nurtur'd that spirit: if like him I dy,
> *I do not imitate*, but Caesars feate
> Rather confirmes that Scaevas act was great.
> In this resolve had Caesar charg'd them all
> Himself alone, and so a glorious fall
> (Slain by a thousand *hands* at once) had met,
> Or else ennobled by a death so great
> Those thousand *hands*; but Fortune was afraid
> To venture Caesar further than her aide
> Could lend a famous rescue, and endeare
> The danger to him; she discovers neare
> Ships of his owne; thither when Caesar makes,
> He finds no safety there, but straight forsakes
> Those ships againe, and leapes into the maine.
> The trembling billowes fear'd to entertaine
> So great a pledge of fortune, one to whom
> Fate ow'd so many victoryes to come
> And Jove (whilest he on Caesars danger lookes)
> Suspects the truth of th' adamantine bookes.
> Who could have thought, but that the gods above
> Had now begun to favour Rome, and love
> Her liberty againe? and that the fate
> Of Pompey's sons, of Cato, and the state
> 'Gainst Caesars fortune had prevailed now?
> Why doe the powers Caelestiall labour so
> To be unjust againe? againe take care
> To save that life they had expos'd so far
> That now the danger even in Caesars eye,
> Might clear their doom of partiality?

103. May 1627. Cf. Norbrook 1999, 43–50 on May's translation.

But he must live until his fall may prove
Brutus and Cassius were more just than Jove.
Now all alone on seas doth Caesar floate;
Himself the oares, the Pylot, and the boate;
Yet could not all these offices employ
One mans *whole strength*, for his left *hand* on high
Raised, holds up his papers, and preserves
The *fame* of his past deedes, his right *hand* serves
To cut the waves, and guard his life alone
'Gainst th' Oceans perills, and all darts, which throwne
From every side doe darken all the sky,
And make a cloud, though heaven it selfe deny,
Two hundred paces thus alone he swam
Till to the *body* of his fleete he came,
His ore-joy'd souldiers shouting to the skies
Take sure presage of future victoryes.

As I have indicated, May picks up on the recurrent body imagery in the *Bellum Civile* with his play on multitasking hands. Not soldiers but rather an anonymous mass of hands are on display: "and so a glorious fall / (Slain by a thousand *hands* at once) had met, / Or else enobled by a death so great / Those thousand *hands*." The Roman state and military body are present when Caesar's body becomes representative for the ship of state: "Himself the oares, the Pylot, and the boate." Furthermore there is a strong reference to Lucan's description of the battle of Pharsalus where the many missiles shut out the sunlight in "and all darts, which throwne / *From every side doe darken all the sky*."[104] The military encounter at Pharos might be just as critical as the battle of Pharsalus but, crucially, May makes very clear that this is the place where repetition ceases: "if like him I dy, / *I do not imitate*, but Caesars feate / Rather confirmes that Scaevas act was great." May takes us to a point from which we can look back to the epic and choose our perspective, ponder its meaning. For he also provides us with his reading of what the *Bellum Civile* is all about. Besides joining in with Lucan's teleology culminating in the death of Caesar as projected toward the very end of the epic as it stands,[105] May employs Plutarch's account in his *Life of Caesar* to focus on a further point. Accordingly May depicts Caesar not only

---

104. Cf. *ferro subtexitur aether / noxque super campos telis conserta pependit* (The ether is screened by steel and a night of weapons joined together hangs above the plain, *BC* 7.519). Cf. Backhaus 2005 *ad loc.*

105. Compare "But he must live until his fall may prove / Brutus and Cassius were more just than Jove" with Lucan's rally for Pompey's revenge in *BC* 10.524–29.

swimming for his life but also desperately seeking to preserve his fame: "[Caesar] holds up his papers, and preserves / The *fame* of his past deeds." Surely, we shall conjecture that Caesar holds in his hand a copy of his *commentarii de Bello Civili.* He becomes a micro-image of the poet by trying to make his own story survive—which later will also become Lucan's in his civil war epic. In May's reading as well, then, Lucan's *Bellum Civile* seems the epic of fame, not fate. In this interpretation the epic's real end point, its actual culmination, is its claim for eternity.

In his continuation proper May displays his political conviction by including a eulogy of Augustus modeled on the *Laus Neronis* of *BC* 1.33–66. Accordingly he spells out the *Bellum Civile*'s drive toward the principate and can afford to draw flattering parallels with the contemporaneous British royal establishment.

> For thee, great Prince, and thy insuing State
> Was Rome opprest, and Iulius fortunate;
> For thee were Marius crimes, and Sylla's wrought:
> For thee was Thapsus and Pharsalia fought,
> That Rome in those dire Tragedies might see
> What horrid dangers follow'd libertie.

It is most telling that May omitted the entire eulogy in the Latin version of his poem after he had changed political camps from monarchists to republicans.[106] May's move away from monarchy toward republicanism is also reflected in the expanded prefatory poem of the 1650 edition of his *Continuation*.[107] Already in the first version of this poem, entitled "The Complaint of Calliope against the Destinies," the deaths of Orpheus and Lucan are conflated through the image of Orpheus's severed head continuing his poetry with disembodied voice as conjured up by Virgil in *Georgics* 4.523–27. However after the decapitation of Charles I in 1649 May prevents "associations with the elegiac cult of Charles the artist-martyr" through additional verses and a thematically connected engraving that redefines Caesar's (and Charles I's) blood as the sacrifice necessary for the completion of the poem.[108] Here Calliope revives Lucan's shade with a drink of royal blood so that he may continue his song. May's interpretation of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* thus shifts from one extreme to the other, a poem written to embalm monarchy turns into a poem that celebrates liberty.

---

106. Bruère 1949, 160.

107. Cf. Norbrook 1999, 225–28. Cf. also Quint 1993, 325–27 on the political undercurrents of Milton's use of Lucan in the *Temptation of Parthia* in the third book of *Paradise Regained.*

108. Cf. Norbrook 1999, 228.

My outline has demonstrated how looking at readers' responses to Lucan's epic, and in particular its end, opens up new perspectives on Lucan's teleology. We have seen how the epic's open-endedness empowers the reader's viewpoints. What is more, whatever reading an audience chooses authorizes it to exploit Lucan's epic for its own purposes. In the end it is thus tempting to suggest a further parallel with Caesar's civil war account: "Caesar's *Civil War* is an unfinished masterpiece. It is incomplete not owing to untimely death, however, but was abandoned by an author who found himself living in a different world than that which saw the work's commencement."[109] One might well substitute Caesar with Lucan at the beginning of this sentence.

109. Batstone and Damon 2006, 3.

Bibliography

Adams, J. N. "Anatomical Terms Used *pars pro toto* in Latin." *PACA* 16 (1982a): 37–45.

Adams, J. N. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary.* London: Duckworth, 1982b.

Ahl, F. "Hercules and Curio: Some Comments on *Pharsalia* IV, 581–824." *Latomus* 31 (1972): 997–1009.

Ahl, F. "The Shadows of Divine Presence in the *Pharsalia.*" *Hermes* 102 (1974): 566–90.

Ahl, F. *Lucan: An Introduction.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Albrecht, Michael von. "Der Dichter Lucan und die epische Tradition." In *Lucain: Sept exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, no. 15), edited by M. Durry, 269–301. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1970.

Albrecht, Michael von. *Roman Epic: An Interpretative Introduction. Mnemosyne,* Supplementum, vol. 189. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Anderson, W. S. "The Artists' Limits in Ovid: Orpheus, Pygmalion and Daedalus." *Syllecta Classica* 1 (1989) : 1–11.

André, Jacques. *Le vocabulaire Latin de l'anatomie.* Collection d'Études Anciennes, no. 59. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1992.

Arnaud, P. "L'Apothéose de Néron-Kosmokrator et la cosmographie de Lucain au premier livre de la '*Pharsale*' (I,45–66)." *Revue des Etudes Latines* 65 (1987): 167–193.

Ash, Rhiannon. *Ordering Anarchy: Armies and Leaders in Tacitus' Histories.* London: Duckworth, 1999.

Assmann, Aleida. *Erinnerungsräume, Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses.* Munich: Beck, 1999 (4th ed. 2009).

Asso, Paolo. "Apostrophe in Lucan." *Materiali e Discussioni* 61 (2008): 245–57.

Asso, Paolo, ed. *Brill's Companion to Lucan.* Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Austin, R. G. *Aeneidos liber primus.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Axelson, B. "Lygdamus und Ovid. Zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung." *Eranos* 58 (1960): 93–111.

Bachofen, Armin. *Cäsars und Lucans Bellum civile: Ein Inhaltsvergleich.* Zurich: Juris-Verlag, 1972.

Backhaus, Birger. *Das Supplementum Lucani von Thomas May: Einleitung, Edition,*

Übersetzung, Kommentar. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium, vol. 65. Backhaus: Trier, 2005.

Baehrens, Emil, ed. *Poetae Latini Minores.* Vol. 5. Leipzig: Teubner, 1883.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World.* Translated by Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Baldini Moscadi, L. "'Murmur' nella terminologia magica." *SIFC* 48 (1976): 254–62.

Bannon, C. J. *The Brothers of Romulus: Fraternal Pietas in Roman Law, Literature and Society.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. "Voices and Narrative 'Instances' in the *Metamorphoses.*" In *Speaking Volumes,* edited by Alessandro Barchiesi, 49–78. London: Duckworth, 2001.

Barkan, Leonard. *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Baroin, Catherine. "Les cicatrices ou la mémoire du corps." In *Corps romains*, edited by Philippe Moreau, 27–46. Grenoble: Jérôme Millon, 2002.

Barratt, Pamela. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis liber V: A Commentary.* Classical and Byzantine monographs, no. 4. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1979.

Bartsch, Shadi. *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Batstone, William W., and Cynthia Damon. *Caesar's Civil War.* Oxford Approaches to Classical Literature. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Beard, Mary. "Did Romans Have Elbows? Or: Arms and the Romans." In *Corps romains,* edited by Philippe Moreau, 47–60. Grenoble: Jérôme Millon, 2002.

Beckby, Hermann, ed. *Die Sprüche des Publilius Syrus.* Munich: Heimeran, 1969.

Bennington, Geoffrey. *Sententiousness and the Novel: Laying Down the Law in Eighteenth-Century French Fiction*. Cambridge Studies in French. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Benz, Lore. "Publilius Syrus." In *Der Neue Pauly*, edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, 582. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2001.

Berthold, H. "Beobachtungen zu den Epilogen Lucans, spez. IV, 402–581, 575–581." *Helikon* 17 (1977): 218–225.

Berti, Emanuele. *M. Annaei Lucani, Bellum Civile, Liber X, testo con commento filologico.* Edited by Gian Biagio Conte. Florence: Felice le Monnier, 2000.

Berti, Emanuele. *Scholasticorum studia. Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale.* Biblioteca di "Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici," no. 20. Pisa: Giardini editore, 2007.

Bing, Peter. "'*Ergänzungsspiel*' in the epigrams of Callimachus." *Antike und Abendland* 41 (1995): 115–31.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Boeke, Hanna. *The Value of Victory in Pindar's Odes: Gnomai, Cosmology and the Role of the Poet.* Brill: Leiden, 2007.

Bömer, Franz. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen. Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern.* Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1969–87.

Bonner, Stanley F. "Lucan and the Declamation Schools." *AJPh* 87 (1966): 257–89.

Booker, Keith M. *Joyce, Bakhtin, and the Literary Tradition: Toward a Comparative Cultural Poetics.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Bouteille-Meister, Charlotte, and Kjerstin Aukrust, eds. *Corps sanglants, souffrants et macabres (XVI–XVII siècle)*. Paris: Presses Sorbonne, 2010.

Braun, L. "Wie Ovid sich die *Fama* gedacht hat (*Met.* 12.39–63)." *Hermes* 119 (1991): 116–19.

Braund, Susanna Morton. *Lucan, Civil War.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bredekamp, Horst. "Die zwei Körper von Thomas Hobbes' Leviathan." In *Geschichtskörper: zur Aktualität von Ernst Kantorowicz*, edited by Wolfgang Ernst and Cornelia Vismann, 105–18. Munich: Fink, 1998.

Brenk, F. E. "Violence as Structure in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" In *Clothed in Purple Light*, edited by F. E. Brenk, 184–96. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999.

Brooks, P. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Brown, R. "The Palace of the Sun in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, edited by Michael Whitby, Philip R. Hardie, and Mary Whitby, 211–20. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1987.

Bruck, Sabine. *Labor in Vergils Aeneis.* Europäische Hochschulschriften. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1993.

Bruère, R. T. "The Latin and English Versions of Thomas May's *Supplementum Lucani*." *Classical Philology* 44 (1949): 145–63.

Büchner, Karl. "Die Elegien des Lygdamus." *Hermes* 93 (1965): 65–112.

Burck, E. "Das Menschenbild im römischen Epos." *Gymnasium* 65 (1958): 121–46.

Burkert, W. *Greek Religion.* Oxford: Blackwell, repr. 1998.

Butler, Shane. *The Hand of Cicero.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

Carey, Chris. "Pindar and the Victory Ode." In *The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical Traditions, Presented to Professor I. G. Kidd,* edited by Lewis Ayres. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1995.

Carter, J. M., ed. *Julius Caesar, The Civil War, Book III, edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1993.

Casamento, Alfredo. *La parola e la guerra. Rappresentazioni letterarie del Bellum civile in Lucano.* Bologna: Patron, 2005.

Catrein, Christoph. *Vertauschte Sinne. Untersuchungen zur Synästhesie in der römischen Dichtung.* Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, vol. 178. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2003.

Cavajoni, G. A. *Supplementum Adnotationum super Lucanum, libri I–V.* Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1979.

Cheney, Patrick Gerard. "'Jog on, Jog on': European Career Paths." In *European Literary Careers: The Author from Antiquity to the Renaissance,* edited by Patrick Gerard Cheney and Frederick Alfred De Armas. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Chester, Alan Griffith. *Thomas May: Man of Letters, 1595–1650.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1932.

Claassen, Jo-Marie. *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius.* London: Duckworth, 1999.

Clark, Gillian. "Bodies and Blood: Late Antique Debate on Martyrdom, Virginity and Resurrection." In *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings,* edited by D. Montserrat, 99–115. London: Routledge,1998.

Clauss, J. J. "The Episode of Lycian Farmers in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" *HSCP* 92 (1989): 297–314.

Clauss, Manfred. *Kleopatra.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995.

Coleman, K. M. "Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments." *JRS* 80 (1990) : 44–73.

Collart, Jean. "Sentences et formules monostiques chez Virgile et Horace." In *Mélanges de philosophie, de littérature et d'histoire ancienne offerts à Pierre Boyancé,* 205–12. Rome: École Francaise de Rome, 1974.

Conte, Gian Biagio. "La Guerra Civile nella Rievocazione del Popolo: Lucano II.67–233." *Maia* 20 (1968) : 224–53.

Conte, Gian Biagio. "Ennio e Lucano." *Maia* 22 (1970): 123–38. Now repr. in Conte 1988.

Conte, Gian Biagio. *La "guerra civile" di Lucano: studi e prove di commento.* Ludus philologiae, no. 1. Urbino: Ed. Quattro Venti, 1988.

D'Alessandro Behr, Francesca. *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism and the Poetics of Passion.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2007.

Dällenbach, Lucien. *The Mirror in the Text.* Translated by Jeremy Whiteley with Emma Hughes. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Danesi Marioni, Giulia. "Di padre in figlio: il '*vir fortis*' in lotta con la fortuna nei due Seneca." *InvLuc* 21 (1999): 123–32.

Dehon, P. J. "Une amphibologie de Lucain (*B.C.* VII, 81)." *Latomus* 48, no. 1 (1989): 120–26.

Desbordes, Francois. "Les vertus de l'énoncé: notes sur les *Sentences* de Publilius Syrus." *La Licorne* 3 (1979): 65–84.

Dettenhofer, Maria H. *Perdita Iuventus, Zwischen den Generationen von Caesar und Augustus. Vestigia, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte.* Munich: Beck, 1992.

Dewar, M. "Laying It on with a Trowel—the Proem to Lucan and Related Texts." *Classical Quarterly* 44, no. 1 (1994): 199–211.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity in Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo.* New York: Ark Paperbacks, 1986.

Due, O. S. "An Essay on Lucan." *C&M* 23 (1962): 68–132.

Duff, J. D. *Lucan: The Civil War.* Loeb Classical Library. London: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Dundes, Alan. "On the Structure of the Proverb." In *The Wisdom of Many: Essays on the Structure of the Proverb,* edited by Wolfgang Mieder and Alan Dundes, 43–64. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981.

Edwards, Catharine. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City.* Roman Literature and Its Contexts. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Eldred, Katherine Owen. "Poetry in Motion: The Snakes of Lucan." *Helios* 27 (2000): 63–74.

Eldred, Katherine Owen. "This Ship of Fools: Epic Vision in Lucan's Vulteius Episode." In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power and the Body,* edited by David Fredrick, 57–85. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Esposito, P. *Il racconto della strage: Le battaglie nella Pharsalia.* Naples: Loffredi: 1987.

Esposito, P. "La morte di Pompeo in Lucano." In *Variazioni sul tema dall' Antichità alla Controriforma,* edited by G. Brugnoli and F. Stok, 75–123. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 1996.

Esposito, P. "La fine di Curione in Lucano." *Vichiana* 4 (2000): 37–54.

Esposito, P. "Paradosso ed esemplarità nell' episodio di Vulteio (*B.C. IV* 402–581)." *Vichiana* 4 (2001): 39–63.

Faber, Richard. "Walter Benjamins Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels und Ernst H. Kantorowicz' *Die zwei Körper des Königs.* Ein Vergleich." In *Geschichtskörper: zur*

Aktualität von Ernst Kantorowicz, edited by Wolfgang Ernst and Cornelia Vismann, 171–86. Munich: Fink, 1998.

Faber, Riemer A. "The Adaptation of Apostrophe in Lucan's *Bellum Civile.*" In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XII*, edited by C. Deroux, 334–43. Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2005.

Fairweather, Janet. *Seneca the Elder.* Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Fantham, E. "Caesar and the Mutiny—Lucan's Reshaping of the Historical Tradition in *De Bello Civili* 5.237–373." *Classical Philology* 80, no. 2 (1985): 119–31.

Fantham, E. *De bello civili, book II.* Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992a.

Fantham, E. "Lucan's Medusa Excursus: Its Design and Purpose." *MD* 29 (1992b): 95–119.

Fantham, E. "The Angry Poet and the Angry Gods: Problems of Theodicy in Lucan's Epic of Defeat." In *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen,* edited by Susanna Braund and G. W. Most, 229–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Fantham, E. *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Fantham, E. "*Discordia fratrum:* Aspects of Lucan's Conception of Civil War." In *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars,* edited by Cynthia Damon, Brian Breed, and Andreola Rossi, 207–21. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Fantham, Elaine, and J. W. Duff. "Publilius Syrus." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary,* edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 1276. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Farrell, Joseph. "The Ovidian *Corpus:* Poetic Body and Poetic Text." In *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and Its Reception,* edited by Philip R. Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 127–41. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1999.

Fauth, W. "Die Bedeutung der Nekromantie-Szene in Lucan's *Pharsalia.*" *RhM* 118 (1975): 325–44.

Feeney, D. C. "*Stat magni nominis umbra*: Lucan on the Greatness of Pompeius Magnus." *CQ* 36 (1986a): 239–43.

Feeney, D. C. "History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld." *PCPhS* 212 (1986b): 1–24.

Feeney, D. C. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Feeney, D. C. "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate." In *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus,* edited by Anton Powell, 1–25. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992.

Feeney, D. C. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History.* Sather Classical Lectures, no. 65. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Feldherr, A. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Finley, M. I. *The World of Odysseus.* Rev. ed. London: Chatto and Windhus, 1964.

Fischli, Walter. *Studien zum Fortleben der Pharsalia des M. Annaeus Lucanus.* Lucerne: Eugen Haug, 1943.

Fitch, John G. *Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, Oedipus; Agamemnon; Thyestes; Hercules on Oeta; Octavia.* Loeb Classical Library, no. 78. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Translated by A. Sheridan. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979.
Fowler, Don. "Second Thoughts on Closure." In *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature,* edited by Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler, 3–22. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997.
Fowler, Don. "Epic in the Middle of the Wood: *Mise en Abyme* in the Nisus and Euryalus Episode." In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations,* edited by Alison Sharrock and Helen Morales, 89–114. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Fraenkel, Eduard. "*Urbem quam statuo vestra est.*" In *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie,* edited by Eduard Fraenkel, 139–41. Rome: Storia e letteratura, 1964.
Friedrich, W.-H. "Ennius-Erklärungen." *Phil.* 97 (1948): 277–301.
Fuhrmann, M. "Die Funktion grausiger und ekelhafter Motive in der lateinischen Dichtung" and its discussion "Kanon und Lizenz in antiker Literatur." In *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste, Grenzphänomene des Ästhetischen,* edited by H. R. Jauß, 23–66 and 531–48. Munich: W. Fink, 1968.
Gaßner, J. *Kataloge im römischen Epos. Vergil-Ovid-Lucan.* Diss., Ludwig Maximilian Universität München. Augsburg: Blasaditsch, 1972.
Getty, R. J. *M. Annaei Lucani de bello civili liber I.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.
Getty, Robert John, and Charles Martindale. *De bello civili I.* London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992.
Giancotti, Francesco. *Mimo e gnome, studio su Decimo Laberio e Publilio Siro.* Biblioteca di cultura contemporanea, vol. 98. Florence: Casa editrice G. D'Anna, 1967.
Gibson, Roy K. "Pliny and the Art of (In)offensive Self-Praise." *Arethusa* 36 (2003): 235–54.
Gilman, Richard. *Decadence: The Strange Life of an Epithet.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1979.
Glaesser, Roland. *Verbrechen und Verblendung: Untersuchung zum Furor-Begriff bei Lucan mit Berücksichtigung der Tragödien Senecas.* Studien zur klassischen Philologie, no. 17. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1984.
Gombrich, E. H. "Personification." In *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500–1500,* edited by R. R. Bolgar, 247–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
Gordon, R. "Lucan's Erictho." In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble,* edited by Michael Whitby, Philip R. Hardie and Mary Whitby, 231–41. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1987.
Goreman, V. B. "Lucan's Epic Aristeia and the Hero of the *bellum civile*." *CJ* 96 (2001): 263–90.
Gowers, E. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
Gowers, E. "The Anatomy of Rome from Capitol to Cloaca." *JRS* (1995): 23–32.
Gowing, Alain M. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture.* Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
Graf, F. "Gestures and Conventions: The Gestures of Roman Actors and Orators." In *A Cultural History of Gesture*, edited by J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg, 36–58. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
Grimal, Pierre. "L'Éloge de Néron au début de la *Pharsale* est-il ironique?" *REL* 38 (1960): 296–305.

Grimal, Pierre. "Le Poète et l'Histoire." In *Lucain: Sept exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, no. 15), edited by M. Durry, 51–117. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1970.

Gualandri, Isabella, and Giancarlo Mazzoli. *Gli Annei: una famiglia nella storia e nella cultura di Roma imperiale: atti del Convegno internazionale di Milano-Pavia, 2–6 maggio 2000*. Como: New Press, 2003.

Gundolf, Friedrich. *Seckendorffs Lucan.* Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse Jg. 1930/31, no. 2, 1930.

Hagendahl, Harald. "Methods of Citation in Post-classical Latin Prose." *Eranos* 45 (1947): 114–28.

Hannah, Robert. "Lucan *Bellum Civile* 1.649–65: The Astrology of P. Nigidus Figulus Revisited." In *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar,* edited by Francis Cairns and Malcolm Heath, 175–90. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1996.

Hardie, Philip R. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Hardie, Philip R. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition.* Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Hardie, Philip R. "The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15: Empedoclean Epos." *CQ* 45 (1995): 103–21.

Hardie, Philip R. "Closure in Latin Epic." In *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature,* edited by Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler, 139–52. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Hardie, Philip R. "Metamorphosis, Metaphor and Allegory in Latin Epic." In *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World,* edited by Margaret H. Beissinger, Jane Tylus, and Susanne L. Wofford, 89–107. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Hardie, Philip R. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002a.

Hardie, Philip R. "Why Is Rumour There? Tracking Virgilian and Ovidian *Fama*." *Ordia Prima* 1 (2002b): 67–80.

Hardie, Philip R. "Lucan's Song of the Earth." In *Papers on Ancient Literatures: Greece, Rome and the Near East. Quaderni del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità e del Vicino Oriente dell'Università Ca'Foscari,* edited by L. Milano and H. Cingano, 305–30. Padova: S.A.R.G.O.N. Editrice, 2008.

Hardie, Philip R. "Fame's Narratives: Epic and Historiography." In *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature,* edited by Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos, 555–72. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.

Hardie, Philip R. *Rumour and Renown: Representations of* Fama *in Western Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hardie, Philip R., and Helen Moore, eds. *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Harich, Henriette. "*Catonis Marcia:* Stoisches Kolorit eines Frauenporträts bei Lucan (II, 326–350)." *Gymnasium* 97, no. 3 (1990): 212–23.

Harries, B. "The Sinner and the Poet: Arachne in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" *PCPhS* 36 (1990): 64–82.

Harris, John R. *The Adaptations of Roman Epic in Medieval Ireland: Three Studies on the Interplay of Erudition and Oral Tradition.* Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1998.

Harrison, Stephen, ed. *Vergilius Maro, Publius. - Aeneid 10 with introduction, translation and commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Haskins, Charles Edmund. *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia.* London: George Bell and Sons, 1887.

Haubold, J. *Homer's People.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Henderson, John. "Lucan, the Word at War." *Ramus: Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature* 16, nos. 1–2 (1987): 122–64.

Henderson, John. "Lucan: The Word at War." In *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War,* edited by John Henderson, 165–211. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998a.

Henderson, John. "Tacitus: The World in Pieces." In *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War,* edited by John Henderson, 257–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998b.

Henderson, John. "Polishing off the Politics: Horace's Ode to Pollio (*Odes* 2.1)." In *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War,* edited by John Henderson, 108–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998c.

Henderson, John. *Telling Tales on Caesar: Roman Stories from Phaedrus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Henss, Dietrich. "Die Imitationstechnik des Persius." *Philologus* 99 (1955): 277–94.

Hershkowitz, Debra. *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica: Abbreviated Voyages in Silver Latin Epic.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Hinds, Stephen. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Hinds, Stephen. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry.* Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hoffer, Stanley E. *The Anxieties of Pliny the Younger*. American Classical Studies, no. 43. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.

Holmes, N. "Nero and Caesar: Lucan 1.33–66." *Classical Philology* 94, no. 1 (1999): 75–81.

Hömke, Nicola. "Ordnung im Chaos, Macht und Ohnmacht in Lucans Erichtho-Episode." In *Mousopolos Stephanos: Festschrift für Herwig Görgemanns,* edited by M. Baumbach, H. Köhler, and A. M. Ritter, 119–37. Heidelberg: Winter, 1998.

Huart, P. *Γνωμη chez Thucydide et ses contemporains: Sophocle, Euripide, Antiphon, Aristophane, Andocide. Contribution à l'histoire des idées à Athènes dans la seconde moitié du Ve siècle av. J.-C.* Paris : Klincksieck, 1973.

Hübner, U. "Hypallage in Lucans *Pharsalia.*" *Hermes* 100 (1972): 577–600.

Hübner, U. "Studien zur Pointentechnik in Lucans Pharsalia." *Hermes* 103 (1975): 200–211.

Hübner, U. "Der Sonnenaufgang vor Pharsalus. Zu Lucan 7.1–3." *Philologus* 120 (1976): 107–16.

Hunink, Vincent, ed. *M. Annaeus Lucanus Bellum civile. Book 3: A commentary.* Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1992

Hunink, Vincent. "Lucan's Praise of Nero." In *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar 7,* edited by Francis Cairns and Malcolm Heath, 135–40. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1993.

Hunt, J. William. *Forms of Glory: Structure and Sense in Virgil's Aeneid.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

Hurschmann, R. "Haartracht." In *Der Neue Pauly,* vol. 5 (1998): 39–45.

Irving, W. "The Legend of Sleepy Hollow." In *History, Tales and Sketches,* edited by James W. Tuttleton, 1058–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Jäkel, Siegfried, trans. *Menander Sentenzen.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1986.
Johnson, C. *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
Johnson, W. R. *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and His Heroes.* Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vol. 47. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987.
Joplin, P. K. "The Voice of the Shuttle is Ours." In *Rape and Representation,* edited by L. A. Higgins and B. R. Silver, 141–59. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957.
Kaufhold, Sh. D. "Ovid's Tereus: Fire, Birds and the Reification of Figurative Language." *CP* 92 (1997): 66–71.
Keith, A. M. "Versions of epic Masculinity in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In *Ovidian Transformations* (*CPhS* Suppl. vol. 23), edited by Philip R. Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 214–39. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1999.
Keith, A. M. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic.* Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Keith, A. M. "Lament in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*." In *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond,* edited by Ann Suter, 233–57. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Kennedy, George Alexander. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C.–A.D. 300.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972.
Ker, James. *The Deaths of Seneca.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
King, H. *Hippocrates' Woman: Reading the Female Body in Ancient Greece.* London: Routledge, 1998.
Kirchner, Roderich. *Sentenzen im Werk des Tacitus. Palingenesia.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2001.
Knecht, Theodor. "Das römische Sprichwort—Abgrenzungen, Formen, Anwendung." In *Reflexionen antiker Kulturen,* edited by Peter Neukam, 47–59. Munich: Bayrischer Schulbuch-Verlag, 1986.
Knox, P. E. *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry. CPhS* Suppl. vol. 11. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1986.
Korenjak, M. *Die Erichthoszene in Lukans Pharsalia: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.
Kühlmann, W. "Katalog und Erzählung: Studien zu Konstanz und Wandel einer literarischen Form in der antiken Epik." Diss. Albrecht Ludwig Universität, Freiburg, 1973.
Kötting, B. "Haar." In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (*RAC*), 13 (1986): 177–203.
La Follette, L. "The Costume of the Roman Bride." In *The World of Roman Costume,* edited by J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante, 54–64. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.
La Penna, A. "La campagna di Curione in Africa. La narrazione e l'interpretazione di Cesare." In *L'ultimo Cesare (Atti di convegno internaz. della Fondazione Niccolò Canussio, Cividale del Friuli, 16–18 sett. 1999),* edited by G. Urso, 175–210. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2000a.
La Penna, A. "Un passo dimenticato di Virgilio. Nota di commento a *Georg.* III.525–530 (e a Lucano IV.799–804)." *SIFC* 18 (2000b): 230–34.
Lapidge, M. "Lucan's Imagery of Cosmic Dissolution." *Hermes* 107 (1979): 344–70.

Larmour, D. H. J. "Tragic contaminatio in Ovid's *Metamorphoses:* Procne and Medea, Philomela and Iphigeneia (6.424–674), Scylla and Phaedra (8.19–151)." *ICS* 15 (1990): 131–41.

Lateiner, D. "Mythic and Non-mythic Artists in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" *Ramus* 13 (1984): 1–30.

Lausberg, H. "Lucan und Homer." In *ANRW* 32.3, 1565–1622. Berlin, 1985.

Le Bonniec, H. "Lucain et la religion." In *Lucain: Sept exposés suivis de discus*sions (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, no. 15), edited by M. Durry, 159–200. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1970.

Leach, Eleanor Winsor. "Ekphrasis and the Theme of Artistic Failure in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" *Ramus* 3 (1974): 102–42.

Leach, Eleanor Winsor. *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Lebek, Wolfgang Dieter. *Lucans Pharsalia: Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug. Hypomnemata.* Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben, vol. 44. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976.

Lee, Hermione. *Body Parts: Essays in Life Writing.* London: Chatto & Windus, 2005.

Leidig, Heinz-Dieter. *Das Historiengedicht in der englischen Literaturtheorie: Die Rezeption von Lucans Pharsalia von der Renaissance bis zum Ausgang des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts.* Bern: Lang, 1975.

Leigh, Matthew. *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement.* Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Leigh, Matthew. "Lucan's Caesar and the Sacred Grove: Deforestation and Enlightenment in Antiquity." In *Interpretare Lucano,* edited by P. Esposito and L. Nicastri, 167–205. Naples: Arte Tipographica, 1999.

Leigh, Matthew. "Lucan and the Libyan Tale." *JRS* 90 (2000): 95–109.

Lewis, Anne-Marie. "What Dreadful Purpose Do You Have? A New Explanation for the Astrological Prophecy of Nigidus Figulus in Lucan's *Pharsalia* I.658–63." In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History,* edited by C. Deroux, 379–400. Brussels: Latomus, 1998.

Lintott, A. W. "Lucan and the History of the Civil War." *CQ* 21 (1971): 488–505.

Long, A. A. "Stoics on World-Conflagration and Everlasting Recurrence." *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 23 suppl. (1985): 13–38.

Loraux, Nicole. *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman.* Translated by Anthony Foster. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Loupiac, Annic. *La poétique des éléments dans La Pharsale de Lucain.* Collection Latomus, no. 241. Brussels: Latomus, 1998.

Lowe, N. J. *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Luck, Georg, ed. *Lucanus, Marcus Annaeus, Der Bürgerkrieg, Latin and German.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985.

Ludwig, Walther. *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965.

Luisi, Aldo. "Lucano e la profezia di Nigidio Figulo." In *La profezia nel mondo antico,* edited by Marta Sordi, 239–44. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1993.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Macleod, Colin. "Horace and the Sibyl (Epode 16.2)." *CQ* 29 (1979): 220–21.

Malamud, M. A. "Happy Birthday, Dead Lucan—(P)Raising the Dead in *Silvae* 2.7." *Ramus-Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature* 24, no. 1 (1995): 1–30.

Malamud, M. A. "Pompey's Head and Cato's Snakes." *CP* 98 (2003): 31–44.

Maltby, Robert. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies.* Arca, no. 25. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1991.

Mankin, David, ed. *Horace, Epodes.* Cambridge Greek and Latin Texts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Marti, B., ed. *Arnulfus Aurelianensis, Glosule super Lucanum.* Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1958.

Marti, B. "Cassius Scaeva and Lucan's *Inventio.*" In *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan,* edited by L. Wallach, 239–57. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966.

Marti, B. "La structure de la *Pharsale.*" In *Lucain: Sept exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, no. 15), edited by M. Durry, 1–50. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1970.

Marti, B. "Lucan's Narrative Techniques." *Parola del passato* 30 (1975): 74–90.

Martindale, Charles. "Paradox, Hyperbole and Literary Novelty in Lucan's *De Bello Civile.*" *BICS* 23 (1976): 45–54.

Martindale, Charles. "Lucan's Hercules. Padding or Paradigm? A Note on *De bello civili* 4.589–660." *Symbolae Osloenses* 56 (1981): 71–80.

Martindale, Charles. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception.* Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Masters, Jamie. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum civile*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

May, Thomas. *Lucan's Pharsalia: or The Civill Warres of Rome, betweene Pompey the great, and Iulius Caesar. The whole ten Bookes.* London, 1627.

May, Thomas. *A continuation of the Subiect of Lucan's historicall poem till the death of Iulius Cæsar.* London, 1630.

May, Thomas. *A continuation of the Subiect of Lucan's historicall poem till the death of Iulius Cæsar, The second edition corrected & amended by T.M.* London: Printed for James Boler at the Signe of the Marigold in Pauls Church-yard, 1633.

May, Thomas. *Supplementum Lucani Libri VII Authore Tho: May.* Leyden, 1640.

May, Thomas. *Supplementum Lvcani libri VII.* Secunda aeditio. ed. London: Typis M. Flesher: Sumptibus D. Frere., 1646.

Mayer, R. *Lucan, Civil War VIII, edited with introduction and commentary.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1981.

Mayer, R. "Pliny and *Gloria Dicendi.*" *Arethusa* 36 (2003): 227–34.

Mazzio, C. "Sins of the Tongue." In *The Body in Parts,* edited by D. Hillman and C. Mazzio, 53–80. New York: Routledge, 1997.

McGill, Scott. *Virgil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Meister, C. "Die Gnomik im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides." Diss. Universität Basel, 1955.

Metger, Wilhelm. "Kampf und Tod in Lucans *Pharsalia.*" In *Lucan,* edited by W. Rutz, 423–38. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.

Mieder, Wolfgang. *Twisted Wisdom.* Burlington: University of Vermont, 1999.

Miura, Y. "Zur Funktion der Gleichnisse im I. and VII. Buch von Lucans *Pharsalia.*" *GB* 10 (1983): 207–32.

Mommsen, Th. *Römisches Staatsrecht.* 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1887.

Morales, Helen. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon.* Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Moretti, G. "Truncus ed altro: appunti sull'immaginario filosofico e scientifico-didascalico nella *Pharsalia.*" *Maia* 37 (1985): 135–44.

Morford, Mark P. O. *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.

Most, G. W. "*Disiecti membra poetae*: The Rhetoric of Dismemberment in Neronian Poetry." In *Innovations of Antiquity,* edited by Ralph Hexter and D. Selden, 391–419. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Müller, Gerhard Anselm. *Formen und Funktionen der Vergilzitate und -anspielungen bei Augustin von Hippo.* Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. 1. Reihe, Monographien; n.F., vol. 18. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 2003.

Murgatroyd, Tom. "Arnulf and Lucan." In *Lucans Bellum Civile Studien zum Spektrum seiner Rezeption von der Antike bis ins 19. Jahrhundert,* edited by Ch. Walde, 67–90. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2009.

Mutschler, F.-H. *Erzählstil und Propaganda in Caesars Kommentarien.* Heidelberg: Winter, 1975.

Nadaï, Jean-Christophe de. *Rhétorique et poétique dans la Pharsale de Lucain: la crise de la représentation dans la poésie antique.* Bibliothèque d'études classiques, no. 19. Louvain: Peeters, 2000.

Nagle, B. R. "Ovid's 'Reticent' Heroes." *Helios* 15 (1988): 23–39.

Narducci, E. "Sconvolgimenti naturali e profezia delle guerre civili: *Phars.* I 512–695." *Maia* 26 (1974): 97–110.

Narducci, E. "Ideologia et tecnica allusiva nella *Pharsalia.*" In *ANRW* 32.3, 1538–64. Berlin, 1985.

Narducci, E. *Lucano: un'epica contro l'impero; interpretazione della Pharsalia.* Rome: Laterza, 2002.

Nicolai, R. "La Tessaglia lucanea e il rovesciamento del Virgilio augusteo." *MD* 23 (1989): 119–34.

Noon, Patrick. *Constable to Delacroix.* London: Tate, 2003.

Norbrook, David. "Lucan, Thomas May and the Creation of a Republican Literary Culture." In *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England,* edited by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, 45–66. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994.

Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Norden, Eduard. *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teuber, 1917.

O'Hara, James J. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid.* Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1990.

O'Higgins. "Lucan as *vates.*" *Class. Ant.* 7 (1988): 208–26.

Oakley, S. P. *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X.* 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997–2005.

Öhlschläger, Claudia, and Birgit Wiens, eds. *Körper—Gedächtnis—Schrift: Der Körper als Medium kultureller Erinnerung.* Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1997.

Oliensis, E. "Canidia, Canicula, and the *Decorum* of Horace's Epodes." *Arethusa* 24 (1991): 107–38.

Oliensis, E. "Sibylline Syllables: The Intratextual *Aeneid*." *PCPhS* 50 (2004): 29–45.

Otis, B. *Ovid as an Epic Poet.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Papaioannou, Sophia. "Epic Transformation in the Second Degree: Lucan's Medusa." In *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert,* edited by Ch. Walde, 216–36. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2005.

Paratore, Ettore. *Lucano.* Filologia e critica, vol. 68. Rome: Ateneo, 1992.

Paulsen, Th. "'Für mich bist du schon ein Gott': die Problematik des Nero-Enkomiums in Lucans Epos Pharsalia." In *Affirmation und Kritik: zur politischen Funktion von Kunst und Literatur im Altertum,* edited by G. Binder and B. Effe, 185–202. Bochum, 1995.

Pavlock, B. "The Tyrant and Boundary Violation in Ovid's Tereus Episode." *Helios* 18 (1991): 34–48.

Pfligersdorffer, G. "Lucan als Dichter des geistigen Widerstandes." *Hermes* 87 (1959): 344–77.

Pichon, René. *Les sources de Lucain.* Paris: E. Leroux, 1912.

Pomeroy, Arthur J. *The Appropriate Comment: Death Notices in Ancient Historians.* Studien zur klassischen Philologie, vol. 58. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

Postgate, J. P., and O. A. W. Dilke. *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili: liber VII.* Rev. ed. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1978.

Preisendanz, C. "De Senecae rhetoris apud philosophum filium auctoritate." *Philologus* 67 (1908): 68–112.

Preiswerk, Rudolf. "'*Sententiae*' in Cäsars Commentarien." *MH* 2 (1945): 213–26.

Price, J. J. *Thucydides and Internal War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Putnam, M. C. J. *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Quint, David. "Repetition and Ideology in the *Aeneid*." *MD* 23 (1989): 9–54.

Quint, David. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Race, W. H. "First Appearances in the *Odyssey*." *TAPhA* 123 (1993): 79–107.

Radicke, Jan. *Lucans poetische Technik: Studien zum historischen Epos.* Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Rambaud, M. "L'Opposition de Lucain au *Bellum Civile* de César." *L'information littéraire* 12 (1960): 155–62.

Rambaud, M. "L'Aruspice Arruns chez Lucain au livre I de la *Pharsale*." *Latomus* 44 (1985): 281–300.

Rambaud, M. "Présages et Procuratio au livre I de la *Pharsale* (vv. 522–638)." In *Hommages à Henri Le Bonniec, Res Sacrae,* edited by D. Porte and J.-P. Néraudau, 373–86. Brussels: Latomus, 1988.

Rayment, C. S. "Echoes of the Declamations in the Dialogues of the Younger Seneca." *CB* 45 (1969): 51–52, 63.

Reinert, Erik. "A Brief Introduction to Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1626–1692)." *European Journal of Law and Economics*, special issue on Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1626–1692), 19 (2005): 221–30.

Reitz, Ch. "Zur Funktion der Kataloge in Ovids *Metamorphosen*." In *Ovid-Werk und Wirkung: Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht*, edited by W. Schubert, vol. 1, 359–72. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999.

Richlin, Amy. "Reading Ovid's Rapes." In *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome,* edited by Amy Richlin, 158–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Richlin, Amy. "Cicero's Head." In *Constructions of the Classical Body,* edited by J. I. Porter, 190–211. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Regenbogen, O. "Schmerz und Tod in den Tragoedien Senecas." *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg VII.* Leipzig, 1930. Repr. in *Kleine Schriften*, edited by V. F. Dirlmeier, 409–62. Munich: Beck, 1961.

Ricoux, Odile. "*Homo astrologicus*: la mélothésie chez les astronomes latins." In *Corps romains,* edited by Philippe Moreau, 201–24. Grenoble: Jérôme Millon, 2002.

Rieks, Rudolf. "Mimus und Atellane." In *Das römische Drama,* edited by Eckard Lefèvre, 348–77. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978.

Riese, Alexander. *Anthologia Latina, pars prior: carmina in codicibus scripta.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906.

Rimell, Victoria. *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Rolim de Moura, Alessandro. "Speech, Voice and Dialogue in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*." DPhil thesis, Oxford, 2008.

Rolim de Moura, Alessandro. "Speeches at War." In *Lucan's Bellum civile: Between Epic Tradition and Aesthetic Innovation*, edited by Nicola Hömke and Christiane Reitz, 71–90. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, vol. 282. New York: De Gruyter, 2010.

Rolland, E. *De l'influence de Sénèque le père et les rhéteurs sur Sénèque le philosophe.* Ghent: van Goethern, 1906.

Rosati, G. *Narciso e Pigmalione: Illusione e spettacolo nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio.* Florence: Sansoni, 1983.

Rosenthal, Georg. "De sententiis horatianis." Diss., Friedrich Wilhelm Universität, Berlin, 1897.

Rosner-Siegel, J. "The Lightning and the Oak." *Athenaeum* 61 (1983): 165–77.

Rossi, A. "The *Aeneid* Revisited: The Journey of Pompey in Lucan's *Pharsalia*." *AJPh* 121, no. 4 (2000): 571–91.

Rossi, A. "*Sine fine*: Caesar's Journey to Egypt." In *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert,* edited by Ch. Walde, 237–60. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2005.

Rotondi, G. *Leges publicae populi Romani.* Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1962.

Russell, Donald A. *Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria—The Orator's Education.* 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Russo, J. "Prose Genres for the Performance of Traditional Wisdom in Ancient Greece: Proverb, Maxim, Apothegm." In *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece,* edited by L. Edmunds and R. W. Wallace, 49–64. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Rutz, Werner. "*Amor mortis* bei Lucan." *Hermes* 88 (1960): 462–75.

Sanford, E. M. "Quotations from Lucan in Medieval Latin Authors." *AJPh* 55 (1934): 1–19.

Saylor, C. "*Belli spes improba:* The Theme of Walls in Lucan's *Pharsalia* 6." *TAPA* 108 (1978): 243–57.

Saylor, C. "Curio and Antaeus: The African Episode of Lucan *Pharsalia* IV." *TAPA* 112 (1982): 169–77.

Saylor, C. "*Lux extrema:* Lucan *Pharsalia* 4.402–581." *TAPhA* 120 (1990): 291–300.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Schiesaro, A. "Il locus horridus nelle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio." *Maia* 37 (1985): 211–23.

Schiesaro, A. *The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Schmitt, Andreas W. "Bibliographischen Nachwort." In *Studien zur Kompositionskunst und zur epischen Technik Lucans,* by Werner Rutz, edited by Andreas W. Schmitt. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1989.

Schmitt, Andreas W. *Die direkten Reden der Massen in Lucans Pharsalia.* Studien zur klassischen Philologie, vol. 95. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1995.

Schmidt, E. A. "Zeit und Raum in Senecas Tragödien: ein Beitrag zu seiner dramatischen Technik." In *Senèque le tragique,* edited by M. Billerbeck, 321–53. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2005.

Schnepf, H. "Untersuchungen zur Darstellungskunst Lucans im 8. Buch der Pharsalia." Diss., Ruprecht Karls Universität, Heidelberg, 1953. Extract of chapter 4, "Der Tod," reprinted in *Lucan,* edited by W. Rutz, 380–406. Wege der Forschung, no. 235. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.

Schönberger, Otto. "Leitmotivisch wiederholte Bilder bei Lucan." *RhM* 103 (1960): 81–90.

Schönberger, Otto. "Untersuchungen zur Wiederholungstechnik Lucans." Diss., Ruprecht Karls Universität Heidelberg, 1961.

Schrijvers, P. H. "Interpreting Lucan with Lucan (La *Pharsale,* Book-1, 1–8 and Book-2, 234–325)." *Mnemosyne* 42, nos. 1–2 (1989): 62–75.

Seckendorff, Veit Ludwig von. *Herrn Veit Ludwigs von Seckendorff. Politische und moralische Discurse über M. Annæi Lucani dreyhundert auserlesene lehrreiche Sprüche und dessen heroische Gedichte, genannt Pharsalia auf eine sonderbare neue Manier ins Deutsche gebracht und dem Lateinischen auf iedes Blatt gegen über gesetzt: nebst beygefügter Erklärung derer dunckeln und schweren Redens-Art: auch nötigem Register.* 2 vols. Leipzig: In Verlegung Moritz Georg Weidmans Erben und Johann Ludwig Gleditsch, 1695.

Segal, Charles. *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Study in the Transformations of a Literary Symbol.* Hermes Einzelschriften, no. 23. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner Verlag, 1969.

Segal, Charles. "Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid and Euripides." *TAPA* 114 (1984): 311–25.

Segal, Charles. "Ovid: Metamorphosis, Hero, Poet," *Helios* 12 (1985): 49–63.

Segal, Charles. *Orpheus: The Myth of the Poet.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Segal, Charles. *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Segal, Charles. "Philomela's Web and the Pleasures of the Text: Reader and Violence in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid." In *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature,* edited by I. J. F de Jong and J. P. Sullivan, 257–80. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Segal, Charles. "Ovid's Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender and Violence in the *Metamorphoses.*" *Arion* 5 (1998): 9–41.

Segal, Charles. "Intertextuality and Immortality: Ovid, Pythagoras and Lucretius in *Metamorphoses* 15." *MD* 46 (2001): 63–101.

Segal, Charles. "*Tantum medicamina possunt:* la magie dans les *Metamorphoses* d'Ovide." In *La Magie: actes du colloque international de Montpellier, 25–7 Mars 1999,* edited by A. Moreau, 45–70. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry, Montpellier III, 2000.

Seidensticker, B. "*Maius solito*: Seneca's *Thyestes* und die *tragoedia rhetorica*." *A&A* 31 (1978): 116–36.

Selinger, R. "Experimente mit dem Skalpell am menschlichen Körper in der griechisch-römischen Antike." *Saeculum: Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte* 50 (1999): 29–47.

Selinger, R. "Das Recht im Bild: Die Forumsszenen der *praedia Iuliae Felicis* in Pompeji." *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 118 (2001): 344–64.

Sennett, Richard. *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization.* London: Faber and Faber, 1994.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. *Anthologia Latina.* Stuttgart: Teubner, 1982.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. *M. Annaei Lucani, De Bello Civili, libri X.* Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1997.

Sherwin-White, A. N. *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Sherzer, Dina. "Saying is Inventing: Gnomic Expressions in *Molloy*." In *Speech Play: Research and Resources for Studying Linguistic Creativity,* edited by Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 163–71. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976.

Shilling, Chris. *The Body and Social Theory.* London: Sage, 1993 (2nd ed. 2003).

Sinclair, Patrick. *Tacitus the Sententious Historian: A Sociology of Rhetoric in Annales 1–6.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.

Sklenar, R. *The Taste for Nothingness: A Study of Virtus and Related Themes in Lucan's Bellum Civile.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

Skutsch, Otto, ed. *The Annals of Q. Ennius.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Solodow, Joseph B. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Spencer, Diana. "Lucan's Follies: Memory and Ruin in a Civil-War Landscape." *G&R* 52 (2005): 46–69.

Spivey, N. *Enduring Creation: Art, Pain and Fortitude.* London: Thames and Hudson, 2001.

Stegner, Klaus. *Die Verwendung der Sentenz in den Historien des Tacitus.* Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004.

Strasburger, G. "Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias." Diss., Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität, Frankfurt am Main, 1954.

Strauch, Solveig. *Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1626–1692). Historia profana et ecclesiastica.* Münster: LIT, 2005.

Sussman, Lewis A. *The Elder Seneca. Mnemosyne* Supplements, vol. 51. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Syme, Ronald. "Verginius Rufus." In *Roman Papers,* edited by Anthony R. Birley, 512–20. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Tarrant, R. J., ed. *Seneca's Thyestes, with Introduction and Commentary.* American Philological Association Textbook Series. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Tarrant, R. J. "Chaos in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and its Neronian Influence." *Arethusa* 35 (2002): 349–60.

Tatum, James. *The Mourner's Song: War and Remembrance from the Iliad to Vietnam.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Ternaux, Jean-Claude. *Lucain et la littérature de l'âge baroque en France, citation, imitation et création.* Paris: Champion, 2000.

Theodorakopoulos, Elena. "Closure and Transformation in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." In

Ovidian Transformations (*CPhS* Suppl. vol. 23), edited by Philip R. Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, 143–61. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1999.

Thiel, Andreas. "Thomas May, *Supplementum Lucani.*" Diss., Universität Salzburg, 1993.

Thompson, L., and R. T. Bruère. "The Virgilian Background of Lucan's Fourth Book." *CPh* 65 (1970): 152–72.

Tränkle, Hermann, ed. *Appendix Tibulliana.* New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.

Tucker, R. A. "*Sententiae* in the *Bellum civile* of Lucan and earlier Latin Epics." Diss., John Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1967.

Tucker, R. A. "Lucan and Phoebus." *Latomus* 42, no. 1 (1983): 143–51.

Turner, Bryan S. *The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1984.

Usener, Hermann. *M. Annaei Lucani Commenta Bernensia. Scholia in Lucani bellum civile.* Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1967.

Vernant, J.-P. "A 'Beautiful Death' and the Disfigured Corpse in Homeric Epic." In *Mortals and Immortals,* edited by Froma Zeitlin, 50–74. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Vessey, David. *Statius and the Thebaid.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Villemonteix, J. "Remarques sur les sentences homériques." *La Licorne* 3 (1979): 85–96.

Vincent, M. "Between Ovid and Barthes: Ekphrasis, Orality and Textuality in Ovid's 'Arachne.'" *Arethusa* 27 (1994): 361–86.

Vitelli, C. "Studi sulle fonti storiche della *Farsaglia*." *SIFC* 10 (1902): 360–429.

Volkmann, H. *Cleopatra: A Study in Politics and Propaganda.* Translated by T. J. Cadoux. London: Elek Books, 1958.

Walde, Christine, ed. *Lucans Bellum Civile, Studien zum Spektrum seiner Rezeption von der Antike bis ins 19. Jahrhundert.* Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2009.

Wheeler, Stephen Michael. *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

Wheeler, Stephen Michael. *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Classica Monacensiam vol. 20. Tübingen: Narr, 2000.

Wheeler, Stephen Michael. "Lucan's Reception of Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" *Arethusa* 35 (2002): 361–80.

Wick, Claudia. *M. Annaeus Lucanus, Bellum civile, Liber IX, Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* 2 vols. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, vols. 201–2. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2004.

Wildberger, J. "*Quanta sub nocte iaceret nostra dies* (Lucan 9, 13f.)—Stoizismen als Mittel der Verfremdung bei Lucan." In *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert,* edited by Ch. Walde, 56–88. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2005.

Williams, Gordon. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire.* Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 45. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Wills, Jeffrey. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Wolpert, A. *Remembering Defeat: Civil War and Civic Memory in Ancient Athens.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Woods, Barbara Allen. "Perverted Proverbs in Brecht and 'Verfremdungssprache.'" *Germanic Review* 43 (1968): 100–108.

Zeller, Rosmarie. "Moralische und politische Modelle und Antimodelle in Seckendorffs

Kommentar zu Lucans *Pharsalia* und in Corneills *La Mort de Pompée*." In *Welche Antike?: Konkurrierende Rezeptionen des Altertums im Barock,* edited by Ulrich Heinen, 753–68. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011.

Zumwalt, N. "*Fama subversa*: Theme and Structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12." *CSCA* 10 (1977): 210–22.

Zwierlein, O. "Das Waltharius-Epos und seine lateinischen Vorbilder." *Antike und Abendland* 16 (1970): 153–84.

Index Locorum

Compiled with the help of Joilson Lorenco dos Santos Junior.

Anaximenes
Ars Rhetorica ad Alexandrum, 11.1, 91n13
***Anthologia Latina* (Riese 1906)**
668 (= *poet. min.* V 74, Epitaphium Lucani), 88n157, 134
719c, 147n92
806 (*Argumenta Lucani*), 144–47
Aristotle
fr. 549 Rose = Athen. 13.576a, 47n156
Arnulf of Orleans
BC 7.727, 112n138

Bible
Acts
16.22–38, 49n166
1 Corinthians
12–27, 17n32

Caesar
Bellum Alexandrinum (Hirtius)
21, 149
Civil War
1.7.1, 135
1.9.2, 135
1.20.3, 128
1.48–52, 131n44
1.52.3, 132
1.53.1, 135
1.59.1, 132n46
1.60.5, 135n56
1.70.5, 130
1.71.1, 130, 131n44
1.72.2, 132n46
1.78, 131n44
1.81, 131n44
1.84, 131n44
2.22.6, 136
3.4.2, 137
3.8.3, 127n34
3.10.5, 129n37
3.27.1, 132n46
3.36.1, 135n57
3.43, 126n30
3.43.3, 135
3.47, 131n44
3.49, 131n44
3.67.5, 129n37
3.68.1, 132n46
3.71.4, 130
3.72.1, 130
3.72.4, 136n58
3.79.3, 132n46
3.79.4, 136

Caesar
Civil War (continued)
3.80.2, 136
3.80.7, 136
3.81.1, 136n59
Callimachus
fr. 110 (Pfeiffer), 46n144
Catullus
66.42, 46, 46n144
Cicero
Catilinam
2.28, 9n2
de invention
1.49, 137n62
de oratore
59, 46n148
Epistulae ad familiars
12.18.2, 97n44
Epistulae ad Atticum
14.2, 97n44

Ennius
Annales
483–84 (Skutsch), 39, 40n119
485–86 (Skutsch), 39n116

Florus
Epitome of Roman History
2.13.4, 96n39
Fortunatianus, C. Chirius
Ars rhetorica
1.5, 134n55

Gellius
Noctes Atticae
17.14, 97n44

Herodotus
Histories
6.114, 48n158
Hirtius
de bello Gallico
8.pr.2, 134
Homer
Iliad
10.457 (= *Odyssey* 22.329), 39
6.459–61, 59n34
Horace
Epodes
16.2, 100, 100n60
16.17–20, 105
16.41–42, 105n95
16.65–66, 105n95

Justinus, Marcus Junianius
Historiarum Philippicarum libri
43.3.4.–13, 47n156

Livy
The History of Rome
1.7.2, 148n94
1.55.5–6, 19
2.32.8, 17n30
4.43.10, 9n2
42.13.7, 9n2
42.40.7, 9n2
Lucan
Bellum Civile
1.1, 9, 96n39
1.1–2, 52
1.2–3, 9n2, 36
1.3, 31
1.5, 124
1.6, 52
1.12, 108n112
1.19–20, 52n7
1.21, 17n37, 18
1.23, 25
1.29, 25n69
1.33–37, 12
1.33–45, 125
1.33–66, 79, 153
1.37, 52
1.45, 52
1.56–57, 13
1.57–58, 124
1.64–65, 52
1.65–97, 124
1.66, 52
1.67, 123
1.72, 100n61, 124
1.72–80, 123
1.74, 123

1.77–78, 14, 123
1.82, 100n61
1.83, 124
1.89–91, 13, 123n23
1.89–93, 124
1.92–97, 52n6
1.95, 123
1.96, 124
1.99, 24
1.99–100, 49n167
1.100–102, 24
1.102, 24
1.104–5, 24
1.105, 24
1.106, 24
1.107–8, 49n167
1.127, 52
1.128, 108n115
1.130, 79
1.131, 52, 52n9
1.133, 53n9
1.135, 53n9, 73
1.143–44, 53n10
1.146–47, 25
1.159, 53
1.174–76, 81
1.186–92, 17, 125
1.195–200, 18n41
1.200, 17n37, 18
1.201–2, 18
1.231–32, 15
1.244–61, 51, 75
1.247, 51n5
1.257–59, 51n5
1.259–61, 51n5
1.269–71, 84
1.273–91, 84
1.285, 18n38
1.352–53, 75
1.357, 75n112
1.359–60, 75
1.359–86, 75
1.366, 108n116
1.369–70, 26
1.369–71, 76
1.372, 75n114
1.374, 75n114
1.374–75, 76
1.377, 75n114
1.385, 75n114
1.386–88, 26, 76
1.388, 76
1.388–91, 76
1.392–95, 76
1.396–465, 51, 76
1.400–402, 76n116
1.409–19, 76
1.429, 76
1.442–43, 76
1.447–48, 76
1.447–49, 76
1.450–62, 76
1.452–53, 76, 102n69
1.457–58, 77, 110n129
1.458–59, 77
1.469, 53
1.469–72, 77
1.472, 53, 77n117
1.475, 77n117
1.477–78, 77n117
1.481–84, 77n117
1.484–86, 77
1.485, 53
1.486–88, 77
1.486–93, 53
1.493–95, 13
1.498–502, 77
1.503–4, 106, 123
1.506, 77n118
1.514, 25n69
1.519, 17n37
1.519–20, 77
1.520, 77n118
1.522–23, 77n118
1.522–83, 77
1.523–24, 77
1.524–25, 124
1.526, 77n118
1.527–28, 77n118
1.530, 77n118
1.531, 77n118
1.535–48, 13, 19
1.540, 15
1.540–54, 15

Lucan
Bellum Civile (*continued*)
1.543–44, 15n25, 78
1.550–52, 78
1.556–60, 78
1.558–63, 125
1.560, 124
1.561, 78
1.563, 108n119
1.564–65, 78
1.564–68, 78
1.569–70, 78
1.572, 78n119, 125
1.574–77, 78
1.578–79, 78
1.580–83, 78,125
1.589, 78n120
1.592–604, 78
1.616–30, 17, 124
1.627–28, 19, 125
1.627–29, 79
1.634, 79
1.634–35, 108n118
1.636–37, 79
1.638, 79
1.642–72, 79
1.650–51, 100n62
1.655–56, 15
1.669, 79n122
1.670, 17n37, 102n70
1.677, 14
1.678–94, 79
1.679–80, 123
1.681, 14n22
1.692–93, 140
1.692–94, 123
1.694, 14n23
1.695, 17, 79, 124
2.23–44, 83n137
2.52, 20
2.54–56, 27
2.56, 17n37
2.65–66, 125
2.91–93, 82n133, 104n87
2.130–33, 82
2.136, 19
2.143–44, 103n77
2.145–46, 126
2.152, 106n98
2.157–58, 137
2.157–59, 126
2.157–60, 46n149
2.160–61, 126
2.169–70, 33n93
2.171, 102n71
2.172–73, 35n99
2.173–94, 46
2.181, 47
2.181–84, 39
2.190–91, 46
2.202, 59n33
2.209–20, 24
2.211, 33
2.212, 128
2.214–16, 33, 126
2.223, 126
2.225–26, 126
2.225–32, 124
2.249–50, 103n78
2.259, 103n79
2.264–66, 103n80
2.711, 128
2.283–84, 108n116
2.297–302, 18, 18n38
2.301–2, 17n37, 18
2.304–7, 18
2.312–13, 18
2.322–23, 108n117
2.326, 15
2.342–45, 83
2.366, 18
2.388, 18
2.519–21, 104n89
2.551–52, 18n38, 104n89
2.573–74, 53
2.575, 106n101
2.582–92, 53
2.600, 53
2.610–12, 106n97
2.633–35, 54
2.644, 108n113
2.653–56, 19
2.727–28, 108n113
3.39–40, 110n129

3.40–41, 15
3.48, 80
3.56–57, 131
3.58, 109n125
3.79, 108n114
3.82–83, 109n121
3.91–92, 18
3.96, 17n37
3.102–8, 136
3.105–9, 17
3.114–16, 24
3.117, 24
3.118–19, 109n125
3.134–36, 110n134
3.141, 24
3.159, 17n37
3.181–83, 56n19
3.192–97, 128
3.202, 20n47
3.228, 141
3.229, 57
3.230–32, 15
3.241–42, 80
3.256–57, 20n47
3.261–63, 141
3.277–79, 81
3.298–762, 105
3.300, 56n21
3.338–39, 26
3.370–72, 103n76
3.388–89, 81n129
3.417, 56n20
3.417–19, 141
3.426, 74
3.439, 86n150
3.512–13, 128
3.521–22, 15, 15n234
3.569, 25n69
3.572–73, 33
3.576–77, 33
3.580–82, 34
3.603, 81
3.603–26, 23, 47
3.607–8, 83
3.608, 47
3.612, 48
3.614–15, 48
3.616, 23n62
3.619–20, 23
3.620, 48
3.625, 23n61
3.689–90, 109n128
3.721–51, 129
3.758, 33n93
3.761–62, 81n129
4.9–10, 106n97
4.12–13, 27
4.24, 76n116
4.48–49, 16
4.52–67, 16n27
4.58–59, 141
4.68–70, 106n98
4.94, 131
4.105, 33
4.123, 86n150, 104n87
4.124, 15
4.141–43, 16
4.166, 106n103
4.185, 109n122
4.210, 102n71
4.227, 102n71
4.253, 103
4.292–336, 131
4.308, 131
4.319–20, 110n134
4.344–62, 104
4.348–51, 105
4.352–53, 109n122
4.355–56, 105n92
4.362, 108n115
4.376, 80n127
4.383–85, 137
4.402–581 (Raft of Vulteius), 122, 127–38
4.478, 110n131
4.479–80, 80
4.509, 55
4.520, 110n129
4.561, 45
4.570, 110n134
4.573–74, 55
4.575–77, 55n17
4.580–81, 110n133
4.581–660, 12

Lucan
Bellum Civile (*continued*)
4.595, 56, 81
4.598, 139n73
4.599, 139n73
4.604, 139n73
4.608–10, 56
4.615, 139n73
4.636, 139n73
4.640–42, 140
4.645, 139n73
4.692, 17n37
4.694, 57
4.702–10, 84
4.715–17, 57n27, 81
4.718, 58
4.749, 108n120
4.773, 25
4.779, 23n59
4.797–98, 84
4.799–804, 84n139
4.810–13, 58n29
4.811–15, 84
4.824, 85
4.915–16, 33
5.36, 141
5.52, 56
5.53, 56
5.70, 14n22
5.73, 14n22
5.117–18, 110n134
5.136, 14n22
5.152, 14n22
5.156, 14n22
5.174, 14n22
5.187, 14n22
5.206–8, 140
5.223, 15n24
5.249–51, 83n133
5.252–53, 22
5.272–73, 103n82
5.287–88, 27
5.293–95, 102n72
5.309, 109n126
5.310–11, 23
5.316, 106n104
5.317–18, 109n125
5.326, 25n69
5.336–39, 16
5.357, 108n117
5.363–64, 110n132
5.385–86, 85
5.391–92, 142
5.398–99, 142
5.407–8, 16
5.424, 14n22
5.442–43, 16
5.468–69, 58
5.499, 85n150
5.499–501, 16
5.510–12, 35n99
5.519–20, 26
5.529–31, 27
5.541–43, 15n24, 16
5.578–84, 74n109
5.579–80, 86n150
5.634, 108n119
5.654–56, 74n109
5.654–71, 132
5.656–57, 81n128
5.661–63, 85
5.662, 18n38
5.664, 85
5.665–68, 86
5.668–71, 86
5.673–74, 142
5.686, 20
5.746–47, 101n64
5.759, 106
5.774–75, 58
5.778–81, 58
5.804–5, 106n105
6.8, 19
6.10, 101n64
6.54, 100
6.140, 23n59
6.140–41, 25
6.147–48, 103n80
6.180–81, 25n66
6.190, 25n69
6.191–92, 24
6.201, 25
6.249, 106n104
6.262, 55n17

6.302, 17n37
6.312, 17n37
6.320–21, 18n38
6.323, 70
6.326, 17n37
6.333–36, 11n10, 15
6.348, 76n115
6.357–58, 30
6.378, 70
6.379, 20n47
6.412, 76n115
6.420, 73
6.433–34, 102n69
6.462–67, 72
6.492–99, 72
6.507–10, 72
6.515, 72
6.515–18, 70
6.527–28, 72n97
6.532, 106n104
6.564–68, 71n91
6.568–69, 71
6.570, 57, 70
6.577–78, 71n93
6.590, 81
6.592, 72n98
6.595, 101n65
6.604–5, 70
6.611–12, 71
6.616–17, 72n98
6.621–22, 85n145
6.622–23, 72n98
6.625–26, 35n99
6.659, 70
6.666, 70
6.671–72, 31
6.685–93, 70
6.692–93; 72
6.716–17, 72n98
6.730–49, 71
6.768–70, 141
6.770–73, 72
6.775–76, 72n98
6.779, 73
6.805–6, 80
6.813, 73
6.819–20, 103n76
7.1–2, 30
7.7–20, 30
7.27, 34
7.29–32, 30
7.35–36, 30
7.37–44, 30
7.45, 30n83
7.51–52, 30
7.55, 102n73, 109n125
7.60, 101n66
7.62–65, 30
7.72–73, 31
7.77–78, 30n85
7.81, 31
7.82, 31, 32
7.85–89, 31
7.91, 17n37
7.104–5, 109n123
7.112, 80
7.116, 34
7.117–19, 31
7.122–23, 108n115
7.125–27, 34n97
7.129–30, 59n33
7.131–33, 31n86
7.134–37, 34n97
7.137–38, 109n127
7.144–48, 140
7.145–50, 34n97
7.152–57, 34
7.165–66, 32, 106n98
7.174–75, 33
7.174–76, 34
7.181–83, 36n101
7.199–200, 15, 23
7.207–10, 54
7.207–11, 36
7.214–15, 30n83
7.233, 34
7.233–34, 108n112
7.253, 31
7.260, 103n81
7.263, 32, 104n86
7.274–75, 32n91
7.278, 34
7.285–86, 32n91
7.292, 34

Lucan
Bellum Civile (*continued*)
7.293–94, 33n92
7.305, 31
7.308–9, 31
7.319, 106n99
7.322, 33n94
7.340–41, 109n123
7.362–63, 32n91
7.371–73, 18n38
7.386, 109n127
7.387–459, 148
7.404–7, 37
7.406, 37
7.410, 18n38
7.418, 17n37
7.421–25, 34
7.439, 17n37
7.451, 31
7.457, 86n150
7.458–59, 18n38
7.462–63, 32
7.464–65, 36n101
7.472, 32n90
7.474, 32
7.486–88, 32n89
7.509, 32n91
7.519, 152n104
7.525–31, 32
7.533, 45
7.535–40, 34n96
7.535–43, 148
7.540–43, 37n102, 123
7.549–78, 32n91
7.552–54, 73
7.552–56, 52
7.556, 17n37, 18n38, 52
7.560–62, 32
7.567, 32
7.568, 32
7.568–70, 74n109
7.569, 32
7.574, 32
7.575, 33n94
7.578–79, 33
7.588, 81
7.597–98, 35
7.603–4, 104n90
7.617–18, 123
7.626–30, 33
7.634, 18n38
7.635–37, 34
7.652–53, 35
7.659–61, 30
7.661–62, 30
7.674–75, 31
7.700, 34
7.706, 106n116
7.712–13, 31
7.717–19, 140
7.721, 35n99
7.721–23, 31
7.727, 112
7.751, 103n83
7.556, 121
7.764–65, 36n101
7.781–83, 36n101
7.786–94, 35
7.789–90, 34
7.806–8, 35
7.810–11, 35
7.813, 101n66
7.814–15, 35
7.818–19, 35
7.823–24, 36
7.824, 106n100
7.836–40, 34
7.845–46, 36
7.849–50, 36
7.861–62, 36
7.871–72, 104n84
8.10–12, 58
8.15, 58
8.17–18, 58
8.19–21, 58n32
8.21–23, 58n31
8.27–32, 83n133, 101n67
8.28–29, 59n33
8.31–32, 110n130
8.33–34, 34
8.51–52, 58
8.56, 59n33

8.56–60, 59
8.60–61, 59
8.72–74, 59n35
8.74, 59
8.75, 59n35
8.76, 59n35
8.78, 59n34, 81
8.80, 59
8.84, 59
8.102, 59
8.105, 59
8.110–11, 81
8.133, 18
8.159–61, 15n26
8.238, 18n38
8.257–56, 141
8.274–76, 59
8.314–16, 59
8.316–21, 59
8.322, 17n37, 18
8.354, 18n38
8.413, 59n35
8.484, 104n85
8.484–95, 111
8.493–94, 109n124
8.504–5, 101n68
8.584–85, 142
8.606–8, 23
8.608–9, 59
8.609–10, 59
8.610–62, 129
8.616–17, 60
8.624, 60
8.631, 110n130
8.634–35, 60
8.661–62, 60n37
8.663–64, 81
8.682, 48
8.682–83, 20
8.687, 60n36
8.698–99, 139
8.715, 60
8.721–22, 139
8.753–54, 140
8.793, 49, 86
8.798–99, 49
8.836, 17n37
8.842–43, 18n38
8.847, 18n38
8.551, 12n10
8.858–59, 58n29
8.859, 60
8.865–72, 60n38
9.14, 49
9.34–35, 107n106
9.85–86, 60n41
9.90–92, 60n
9.93–94, 60
9.98–100, 60
9.108, 107n110
9.123–24, 20
9.123–25, 20
9.139, 60n39
9.171–73, 142
9.199, 102n74
9.222–23, 142
9.229, 102n74
9.283, 107n107
9.299, 105n92
9.315, 15
9.405–6, 107n108
9.466–68, 13n14
9.528, 15
9.582–83, 110n130
9.602, 17n37
9.619–99, 45
9.652, 45n142
9.654–58, 11
9.666, 20
9.672, 45n143
9. 673, 20
9.675, 46
9.682–83, 45
9.700, 20n49
9.719, 20, 20n49
9.739, 20n49
9.830–33, 39
9.836, 81n130
9.848–49, 107n109
9.879–80, 107n109
9.898, 102n75
9.953, 57

Lucan
Bellum Civile (*continued*)
9.955–56, 76n116
9.961, 53n10, 57
9.969, 101n68
9.982–85, 54
9.985, 28
9.985–86, 87
9.1029–30, 60n39
9.1035, 60n36
9.1036, 35
9.1070–71, 21
9.1079–80, 57n25
9.1088–89, 105n93
9.1102–4, 105n94
9.1104, 18n38
10.1, 21
10.4–6, 21
10.27–28, 17n33
10.29, 56n19
10.44–45, 17
10.184–85, 57
10.185–87, 142n84
10.191, 20
10.191–92, 20, 52n8
10.251, 15
10.284–5, 81
10.295, 20
10.325, 34
10.348, 21n51
10.364–65, 21n51
10.377–78, 81
10.391–94, 21n51
10.434–35, 14
10.444, 109n124
10.463–64, 21
10.464–67, 21, 21n52
10.488, 60n38
10.524, 147
10.524–29, 152n105
10.526–29, 148
10.529, 147
10.530–32, 141
10.538–39, 107n111
10.546, 148n93

Lucretius
De rerum natura
3.642–56, 40, 40n116, 40n119
6.340–42, 66n67

Macrobius
Saturnalia
2.7, 97n44

Oracula Sibyllina
3.363–64 (= 8.165–66), 100n60

Ovid
Metamorphoses
1.2–3, 18n41
1.156–60, 12n11
1.583–750- 41
2.8, 42n125
2.327–28, 86n151
3.110–11, 129
3.117, 128
4.1–415, 41
4.495, 71n94
5.1–249, 43
5.104–6, 40
5.115, 40
5.115–16, 44
5.140, 47
5.177–209, 38n110
5.555–56, 42n125
6.1–145, 41
6.424–674, 41
6.441–70, 38n110
6.550, 42
6.555–56
6.557, 40
7.47, 42n124
7.142, 128
11.50, 40
12.39–63, 43
12.47, 70n89
12.49, 71n96
12.53–55, 70n89
12.60, 70n88
12.62–63, 71
15.819, 73n99

15.825, 73n99
15.871, 74n107
15.879, 39n115
15.879, 43
Ars Amatoria 1.30, 18n41

Petronius
Satyricon
55, 97n44
Phaedrus
Fables
3.10, 100n58
Plautus
Mercator
374–75, 112
Plutarch
Caesar
16, 48n158
49.4, 150
Cicero, 48–49, 49n167
Crassus, 31–33, 49n167
Publilius Syrus
Sententiae
A14–47 (selection), 90–91
Frag. 2, 95n31

Quintilian
Institutio Oratoria
3.8.23, 137n61
3.8.30, 137n61
4.2.53, 134
5.11.1, 137n62
6.1.52, 94
8.5.1, 91n13
8.5.15–19, 91n11
8.5.34, 91n12
9.4.30, 134
10.1.90, 89n2, 89n3
11.3.65–136, 46n148

Sallust
Catilinae Coniuratio
5.2, 9n2
Historiae
1.44, 47n151

Seneca the Elder
Controversiae
1.pr. 6, 93
1.pr.23, 93
1.22, 93n22
2.pr.5, 93n22
2.2.8, 96n40
7.pr.9, 93n22
7.3.8, 97n44
10.pr.16, 93
Suasoriae
7.14, 49n167
Seneca the Younger
Epistulae
94.43, 94–95, 97n45
94 and 95, 95n31
Thyestes
4–5, 120
13, 121
13–15, 120
18–20, 120
1112, 121
Statius
Silvae
2.7.54–74, 87n156
Suetonius
Divus Julius
68, 48n158

Tacitus
Dialogus
20.4, 97n43
22.3, 97n43

Valerius Maximus
Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri
3.2.22, 48n148
Varro
De Lingua Latina
6.29, 51n4
Virgil
Aeneid
1.2, 105
1.8–11, 101

Virgil
Aeneid (*continued*)
1.241, 79n122
1.568, 14
1.627, 95n36
2.325, 80
2.349, 22n54
2.354, 95n36
3.284, 14n21
3.303–4, 59n34
3.508, 14n21
3.637, 14
4.6, 14
4.11, 22, 22n56
4.181–83, 71n90
4.232, 80
4.246–51, 11n9
4.272, 80
4.607, 14
5.729, 22n54
6.33, 47
6.93–94, 140
6.756–59, 80
7.1–4, 80
7.131, 129n35
7.135, 129n35
10.216, 14
10.395–96, 39n116, 40n119
11.641, 22n56
11.644, 22n56
11.913, 14
12.176, 14
Georgica
3.525–26, 84n139
4.523, 40n119
4.523–27, 153

General Index

Aeneid, 10–11, 14, 22, 37–38, 40, 46–47, 52, 55, 59–60, 62–65, 69, 71, 73, 78, 80, 86, 99–101, 105–6, 119–20, 122, 132, 136, 140–42, 143, 148
antiproverb, 111–14
apocalypse. *See* downfall
Appendicula (Pharsaliae Lucani), 148–49
Argumenta Lucani, 144–47
automatism of cut-off body part, 37–49

Bakhtin, 28
body imagery, 10–49
  body of Alexander the Great, 17
  body of Nero, 12–13
  body of Rome, 17–18
  cosmic body, 11–16
  human body, 23–27
  military corps, 22–23
  Roman state body, 16–21
  textual body, 27–29, 36–37
Brutus, 81, 103, 108, 140

Caesar, 5–15, 27, 31–35, 47, 52–58, 60–61, 63–64, 69, 73–77, 80–87, 96–97, 99, 101–2, 104–9, 121–23, 126–54
  as *fulmen*, 63
  as *mirator famae* (admirer), 57
  and Rome, 17–18
caput mundi (head of the world), 19–21, 29, 48, 53, 122, 125, 129

Cato, 18, 20, 46, 61–62, 64, 74–75, 83, 103, 105, 107–8, 141, 143
clemency, 104
Continuation (Thomas May), 150–53
control level, 62–63, 74
Cornelia, 18, 30, 58–60, 81, 101, 106, 142
cosmic cycles, 122–25
Crassus, 23–24, 49
Curio, 57–58, 83–85, 87, 129

Daedalus, 47
decus, 81
devotio, 18
direction (lack of), 64n59
Domitius Ahenobarbus, 25
downfall, 100–101

Emathion, 43
ending, 64n57
epic of *Fama* (not Fate), 62
epitaphic gestures, 82–88
Erictho, 35, 57, 62–75, 78, 81, 141–42
  and Jupiter, 72
excerptability, 28, 92–93, 97, 118

facies/vultus (face), 33
Fama, 9, 36, 43, 50–89, 134–39
  definition, 50–51, 53, 56, 66
  distribution, 54–55
fear, 108–9

food and drink, 131–32
forgiveness, 86, 104
Fortuna, 25, 32, 58, 74, 82, 86, 101, 108, 114, 132–33, 140, 149
fuga (flight), 105–7
funera mundi (apocalypse), 34, 36. *See also* downfall

geopoetics, 76
gigantomachy, 11–13, 34, 56, 67, 74, 125, 140
Gloria, 80–81
gods, 74–75
guilt, 103–4

head of Pompey, 20–21, 23, 31, 47–49, 53, 60, 67, 86, 105, 126, 129
Hercules and Antaeus, 12, 14, 56, 57, 61, 67, 81, 140
historic cycles, 125–27
hypallage, 25, 44–45
hyperrealism, 38

iterum/rursus, 125–26, 140–43

labor, 100–101
Lampetides, 43–44
Lévi-Strauss, 119
Locus horridus, 66
Lucan and *Fama*, 62, 87–88
  authorial voice, 92
  self-memorialization, 92

manus, 25–27
Marcia, 6, 18, 83
Marius, 19, 39, 52, 78, 82, 87, 104, 121, 124–25, 139, 153
Marius Gratidianus, 46–47
Massilia, sea battle, 47–48
May, Thomas, 150–53
Medusa, 20, 45–46
Menenius Agrippa, 17
Metamorphoses, 10, 28, 37, 39–44, 63, 66, 69, 71–72, 74, 87, 119, 122, 128, 132
Metellus, 24, 110n134
mors (death), 109–10

nefas (sacrilege), knowledge of, 51–53
Nero, 12–13, 52, 74, 88, 117, 124, 143
Nero encomium, 79–80
Nile, 20, 34, 52, 54, 64, 81

pax (peace), 102
personification, 65–66
places of memory, 55–56
Philippi = Emathia = Pharsalus, 64n55
Philomela, tongue of, 41–42
plus quam (more than), 9, 120–21, 123
Pompey, 13, 15, 17–21, 23–24, 30–35, 46–49, 52–53, 55–62, 64, 67, 69–70, 73–74, 80–84, 86–87, 99, 101–3, 105–9, 111, 126, 128–30, 132–33, 135–37, 139–48
  Pompey and Rome, 18
  Pompey and *Fama*, 58–60
prophecy, 63–64, 72–73, 140
Publilius Syrus, 90–91, 95, 97–99

raft, 133–34
repetition, 119–54
Roman Republic, memory of, 37

Scaeva, 24–25, 54–55, 61
scars, 12n13, 36
Seckendorff, Veit Ludwig von, 114–18
semianimus, 40
sententiae, 89–118
  gnomic/rhetorical, 91–92
  nomothetic, 94–95, 98–99, 110–11
Sextus Pompey, 69–73, 80
spectacle, 38, 60, 95, 129–31
Sulla, 24, 52, 78, 99, 102, 121, 124–25, 139, 153
sun (Phoebus, Titan), 14–15
Supplementum Lucani, 150–53
sympatheia, 33–36

triumph, 107–8

Verulanus, Johannes Sulpicius, 148–50
Vulteius, 54–55, 80, 82, 84, 122, 126–43