Summer 2010

Lucan's Cato, the defeat of victory, the triumph of memory

Mark Allen Thorne
University of Iowa

LUCAN'S CATO, THE DEFEAT OF VICTORY, THE TRIUMPH OF MEMORY

by

Mark Allen Thorne

An Abstract

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of
Philosophy degree in Classics
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

July 2010

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Carin M. C. Green

ABSTRACT

This dissertation provides a new examination of the figure of Cato within Lucan's epic poem *Bellum Civile* by focusing on the theme of memory within the epic and its interaction with Cato's character specifically. It argues that one may read the epic as possessing the rhetorical function of a literary funeral *monumentum*, the purpose of which is to retell the death of Rome in the Roman Civil War, mourn its passing, and yet in so doing simultaneously preserve its memory so that future generations may remember the liberty Rome once possessed and may be influenced by that memory to action. In this reading, the epic itself—like Cato within the epic—offers a counter-memory of what the civil wars meant to Rome in competition with that promoted by Caesar and his descendants.

The study centers upon the speech of Cato found in Book 2 in which Cato states his two major goals for participation in the civil war: successfully commemorate a perishing *Roma et Libertas* and transform his own defeat into a self-sacrifice that is beneficial to his fellow Romans. The opening chapters place Cato's speech into its larger context by arguing that it is an integral part of a narrative arc spanning most of the first two books. The image of national suicide within the epic's proem reveals that gaining victory in civil war is what assures self-defeat. This economy of universal defeat pervades Lucan's epic and stands as the greatest threat facing Cato in the successful achievement of his goals. Lucan also shows that the very nature of civil war poses a threat to the viability of memory, as evidenced by scenes in which Roman soldiers and citizens forget and abandon the social ties that bind their identity to that of Rome.

Cato's speech illustrates that his chosen weapon against the epic's economy of defeat will be the power of memory. A careful analysis of the speech reveals that Cato's desired goal of enacting a self-sacrifice—a nod to his future suicidal martyrdom at Utica—can transform him into a *monumentum* of 'Old Rome' (the pre-Caesarian Rome that still retained its *libertas*) which will in turn ensure his second goal of achieving

funeral commemoration of what Rome used to be—and could still be again. The closing chapter examines key passages in Book 9 in which the power of memory is explicitly connected with renewal even in the midst of defeat, suggesting that Cato's (and the epic's) mission to preserve memory can be ultimately successful. This reading of Lucan's Cato has the benefit of showing that his success need no longer be based mainly upon whether or not he can *be* a virtuous *sapiens* but also upon what he can actually *do* for future generations of Romans by preserving the powerful memory of a Rome that still possessed her freedom from the Caesars.

Abstract Approved: _____
Thesis Supervisor

_____
Title and Department

_____
Date

LUCAN'S CATO, THE DEFEAT OF VICTORY, THE TRIUMPH OF MEMORY

by

Mark Allen Thorne

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of
Philosophy degree in Classics
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

July 2010

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Carin M. C. Green

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

_____

PH.D. THESIS

_____

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Mark Allen Thorne

has been approved by the Examining Committee
for the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy
degree in Classics at the July 2010 graduation.

Thesis Committee: _____
Carin M. C. Green, Thesis Supervisor

_____
Mary Depew

_____
John Finamore

_____
Robert Ketterer

_____
Russell Valentino

Meis parentibus optimis carissimisque
qui semper foverunt et numquam fidem amiserunt.
Omnis soli Deo gloria.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1
REMEMBERING LUCAN'S CATO – A REASSESSMENT

Lucan and Memory

One of the most remarkable things about Lucan's epic on the Roman Civil War—that cataclysmic *furor* that made Caesar the *victor* and marked both the death of the old Roman Republic and the birth of the Principate—is the fact that it was composed at all. Choosing to recall something as politically sensitive and controversial as the civil wars during the Principate could be a dangerous proposition, one which most people thought was best left unattempted. The future emperor Claudius as a young man had the ambition of writing a history of Rome's more recent events, but warnings from his mother and grandmother convinced him to skip from Caesar's death straight to the peace instituted by Augustus after his final victories over his rivals, for he realized that he would not be able to speak freely or truly (*neque libere neque vere*) about the full events of those times.[1] Valerius Maximus, discussing *exempla* of *patientia*, cites only two famous Romans before moving on, offering as his excuse that it would be best to stop there lest he "be forced to proceed into the accursed memory of the civil wars."[2] And Labienus is cited by Seneca the Elder as declaring that the best way to deal with civil wars in public discourse was to forget it even happened: *optima civilis belli defensio oblivio est*.[3] Yet with Lucan we suddenly find an entire epic poem dedicated to a forceful and emotional

---

[1] Suetonius, *Claud*. 41. Cf. Osgood (2006: 1ff).

[2] Val. Max. 3.3.2: *ne…ad civilium bellorum detestendam memoriam progredi cogar*. See Gowing (2005: 55).

[3] Seneca Maior, *Cont*. 10.3.5. Cf. Walter (2004: 29), Gowing (2005: 82).

exploration of this very subject that others had for so long considered taboo.[4] The *Bellum Civile* comes then as something of a shock to the Roman system in that it is a conscious act of choosing to remember and of calling its readers to do the same.[5] By the fact of its very existence Lucan's epic pits *memoria* against *oblivio*, or rather, Lucan's memory of the civil wars against a competing memory that often chose the path of forgetting.[6]

Throughout this study, I propose to read the *Bellum Civile* itself as a kind of literary *monumentum*. Such a perspective invites us to reconsider memory as a crucial theme in the narrative and take a closer look than has traditionally been made at the ways in which this *memoria* operates throughout the epic.[7] This is in one sense natural, since at its heart epic as a genre "most centrally…memorialises the events that singers

---

[4] All of this suggests to me that Petronius in his own short *Bellum Civile* (put into the mouth of Eumolpus at 119.1-124.1) is responding in some way directly to the shock of Lucan's own work. For an assessment of possible motives behind Petronius' composition, see Courtney (2001: 184-9). Seneca the Younger at times does recall the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, e.g. *Ep*. 14.13 and 104.30, but always for the purposes of discussing an *exemplum* of some virtue, usually that of Cato. Mayer (1981: 3-4) suggests that the theme of civil war might have been "unexceptional" given the fact that even Augustus and the other Julio-Claudians were hesitant to identify themselves too closely with Caesar. I argue, however, that this view underestimates the extent to which the entire Augustan regime is implicated in this threat to remembering. Gowing (2005: 68) points out that it became the trend in Neronian-age literature to dwell even less on the Republican past than was the case under Tiberius.

[5] Throughout this study I will refer to the title of the epic as the *Bellum Civile* or *BC*, in line with much of current practice. There is an old debate about the intended name of the epic: the manuscripts typically give *De Bello Civili* while many scholars have over the last couple centuries named it the *Pharsalia* (and some still do), reading Lucan 9.985 as the author's own declaration of the name of the work. For a summary of the arguments, see Ahl (1976: 326-32).

[6] This is not to suggest that Lucan's contemporaries had forgotten that the civil wars ever took place, for they surely had not. Caesar's commentaries on them were available, and the many references to the civil wars in the Augustan poets would keep some knowledge of the historical events alive and well—but only to a point. In the aftermath, it was clearly in the best interest of the Principate to handle such a traumatic series of events by recasting them in as favorable a light as possible, a process that required selectively promoting some memories while overlooking others. As we will see below, Lucan argues that what is in danger of being forgotten is not whether they happened but what they truly *meant* to Rome.

[7] The approach of reading Lucan through the lens of his engagement with *memoria* has been largely overlooked until recently. Quint (1993: 389) suggests in an endnote that one of the purposes of the BC was "a keeping alive of historical memory" regarding the *libertas* Rome enjoyed before the Caesars, but he does not expand on this. Gowing (2005) broke much needed ground in this area; his approach is discussed below in the survey of scholarship. I will continue to develop this initial discussion of memory over the next few chapters.

celebrate."[8] What follows, however, will attempt to show not merely that memory is implicit in the genre or in the historical subject matter, but rather that it forms an integral part of Lucan's poetics. Research into what may be called memory studies in the past two decades has greatly benefited our ability to appreciate the functioning of memory as a thematic force within Lucan.[9] Memory of past events entails not just a neutral recalling of facts but is by its very nature a constructive act that rhetorically shapes those past events into a narrative that is meaningful to the subject. Joseph Farrell provides a very helpful definition of memory in this sense when he argues that it is:

> …conceived as a process through which artifacts representing the past are constantly being consumed and reproduced…On this reading memory is not an object but a phenomenon, a process in which an individual mnemonic act represents a specific memory of the past, embodies this memory in a new form appropriate to the present, and produces new memories destined to serve the future."[10]

This illustrates well the fact that memory by definition is the point at which all three temporal realms intersect—past, present, and future. How a society remembers its past helps determine how it views itself, and thus memory is intimately connected with the construction of identity.[11] For Julio-Claudian Rome, it was also true that how you died—

---

[8] Foley (2004: 171).

[9] Halbwachs (1950) represents one of the foundational studies in developing research into what he coined "collective memory" of a society. Also useful are Terdiman (1993) and Le Goff (1996), and more recently Ricoeur (2004). In Classical Studies, the series of articles by Small and Tatum (1995) and Ferrell (1997) helped set the stage in this regard. The past few years has witnessed a veritable explosion of insightful studies into memory in the classical world, often in association with the study of death and memorialization practices, and this has been particularly so for the Roman world; see e.g. Hope and Marshall (2000), Citroni (2003), Carroll (2006), Corbier (2006), Flower (2006), Benoist (2007), Duffalo (2007), Edwards (2007), Hope (2007), Rea (2007). I have also found beneficial some studies on modern societies' collective memories in response to large-scale traumas, e.g. Blair (2004) on the American Civil War, Neal (2005) on various episodes in 20th and 21st century America, Levy and Sznaider (2006) on the Jewish Holocaust, and Gourevitch (1999) on the 1994 Rwandan civil war and genocide.

[10] Farrell (1997: 375).

[11] See Le Goff (1996: 98), Citroni (2003: vi).

specifically how others viewed your death—helped determine how you would be remembered and thus your continuing post-mortem identity.[12] This is why in this epic world of a society's suicide brought about through civil war (1.2-3) it is precisely the identity—and thus the future—of Rome herself that is at stake.

The *Bellum Civile* thus becomes a kind of *competing* memory set alongside the standard memory promoted by Augustus and the rest of the Julio-Claudians concerning the civil wars and the birth of the Principate.[13] He who controls how a people's past is remembered can go a long way in controlling the direction of that people's future.[14] Augustus and his heirs promoted the ideology that these wars produced the restoration of the *Respublica* under the new institution of the Principate; this ideology created a sanctioned "memory" that could skirt the civil wars themselves while celebrating the Augustan regime and the idea of the rejuvenation of Rome it was supposed to entail.[15]

---

[12] Edwards (2007: 5) writes of how so many Roman writers of the late Republic and early Principate share "a perception of death as a privileged moment which has the capacity to reveal the true character of the dying subject." In essence I see some very profitable similarities between what Lucan is enacting at a literary level and the "death spectacles" that Romans such as Seneca or Petronius enact at the personal level. Just as these men gathered an audience of spectators for their moment of suicide (and thereby have a hand in fashioning how they would be remembered), Lucan's epic text creates a literary audience for *Roma* herself and her suicide with similar rhetorical goals in mind.

[13] Cf. Gowing (2005: 82), Stover (2008: 572). Lucan's narrative only addresses the first round of civil wars, that between Pompey and Caesar, but the matron's god-inspired prophecies at the end of Book 1 that anticipate the Battle of Philippi (1.678-694) suggests that Lucan's overall theme encompasses the whole round of civil wars and what they meant to Rome, culminating in Octavian's final victory over Antony many years later.

[14] Cf. Hope (2007: 47), "Controlling how the past, and individuals from the past, should be remembered was a symbol of power. The living could be acutely conscious of constructing a suitable posthumous memory; they thought about how future generations would think of them."

[15] In addition to the hopeful verses often found in the Augustan poets (e.g. Vergil's *Eclogue 4* and Horace's numerous poems in praise of Augustus and his conquering of his many foes), one need only consider the countless efforts made by Augustus himself to frame his reign rhetorically not as the result of civil war but as the restoration of Rome in an age of peace and plenty—always with him at the head. Examples range from the proclamations of republican restoration on the *Res Gestae* to the imagery on the Ara Pacis on down to numismatic iconography. On these see the classic study of Zanker (1988: 167ff); see also Gowing (2005: 132ff); Rea (2007: 10); Osgood (2006: 199 *et passim*).

For Lucan, this culminates in Nero's own propaganda program of would-be "Golden Age" renewal, reshaping Roman memory in a way that Spencer describes as essentially "Neronian 'memory-death.'"[16] Lucan's epic, however, throws back into his readers' faces the gritty horror of the initial civil war that made this "restoration" possible and effectively declares that this war between Caesar and Pompey in fact *cost* Rome something far more sinister. A great anxiety that drives Lucan's epic of commemoration is that people are always in danger of forgetting what the civil wars really *meant*.[17] This epic portrays the answer in overtly funereal terms: the civil wars meant nothing less than the death of Rome—more specifically the Rome that existed before the Caesars—and the loss of the *libertas* that was her prized possession.[18] Lucan is not merely waxing poetic when he writes that the victory of Caesar at Pharsalus amounted to a *funus mundi* (7.617).[19] I propose that Lucan's epic accordingly can be read as possessing the function of a literary funeral monument, one that seeks to preserve the memory of a free Rome for his own and future generations. The character who most embodies this urge to preserve and pass on memory is Cato Uticensis. The purpose of this dissertation is to demonstrate and explore the epic's engagement with concepts of memory specifically by analyzing the crucial role that Cato plays in this epic task.

---

[16] Spencer (2005: 49).

[17] Cf. Gowing (2005: 79).

[18] This formula is most clearly expressed by Cato at 2.301-3 (*non ante revellar | exanimem quam te complectar, Roma; tuumque | nomen, Libertas, et inanem persequar umbram*), to be discussed further below. A full discussion of *libertas* and what it might mean to Lucan lies beyond the scope of this dissertation; for good summaries see Wirszubski (1950: 124ff); Rudich (1997: 125-127); Hill (2004: 196).

[19] See especially Lucan's comments at 7.131-3 and 7.418-9. Cf. Ahl (1976: 57), Rudich (1997: 149).

The Legend of Cato Uticensis

Lucan's Cato does not appear out of a vacuum but in fact emerges out of a rich tradition that developed about the man after his suicide at Utica in 46 BC and which had been growing into legendary status for over a century by Lucan's time. What follows is a survey of the evolution of the Cato legend ("myth" would not be too strong a word) up through the Neronian period. It is important to understand the matrix of stories and views surrounding Cato that Lucan would have been familiar with, for a knowledge of this contextual background will ultimately help us recognize more clearly the specific features of Lucan's own treatment.

Marcus Porcius Cato Uticensis (95–46 BC), the great-grandson of the famous Cato Censor, was famous in his own time and after for his active political life that was marked by an uncompromising manner and a rigid dedication to the Roman ideal of *virtus* (informed by Stoic principles) that set him apart.[20] This way of life won him many admirers but also at times alienated others.[21] With regard to the Roman Civil War of 49-45 BC, his role historically was that of a supporting player.[22] He joined the senatorial faction led by Pompey against Caesar, and his service in the conflict was largely

---

[20] Our best sources for Cato's life are the contemporary references in Cicero's writing (especially his letters) and Plutarch's biography. The standard modern scholarly study of Cato is still Fehrle (1983); also useful are Russo (1974) and the recent study by Marin (2009) on the end of the Republic that focuses on Cato as a catalyst for events.

[21] Cicero provides many examples of clear admiration, e.g. *ad Att.* 2.5.1, *Tusc. Disp*. 5.4, *De Fin.* 3.6. Cicero's frustration with Cato's ineptitude for political compromise also comes out occasionally, e.g. *De Off.* 3.8 and *ad Att*. 1.18.7 (*unus est qui curet constantia magis et integritate quam, ut mihi videtur, consilio aut ingenio, Cato…*). See Goar (1987: 13-15) for a summary of Cicero's treatment of Cato.

[22] Our main extant sources for the Roman Civil War are Caesar's *Bellum Civile* (and their sequels by other hands), the letters of Cicero, Velleius Paterculus, Lucan, Suetonius, Appian, Cassius Dio, and the relevant lives of Plutarch. Unfortunately lost are the histories of Asinius Pollio, who was an eyewitness of many of the main events as a follower in Caesar's camp, and the books of Livy on this period (109-116 according to the *Periochae*). The general consensus is that Livy's treatment was one of Lucan's major guiding sources, e.g. Pichon (1912) and Radicke (2004).

peripheral to the main theaters of action. During the decisive Battle of Pharsalus, he stayed at Dyrrhachium to keep the port secure for Pompey's fleet, and after Pompey's defeat he gathered up the remants of the army as best he could and traveled to Africa to continue the fight. Cato similarly was not at Thapsus (46 BC) but was standing governor at Utica when he learned of Scipio's decisive defeat. Knowing that defeat in Africa was now certain and being unwilling to submit to Caesar, he killed himself. On top of his reputation for *virtus*, his last act became his defining moment, for ultimately it was the manner of his death—guided by consistent principle rather than self-serving fear—that enshrined him within the Roman imagination.[23] Almost immediately Cato was transformed into a ideological martyr for the now-lost Republic and its accompanying senatorial *Libertas*.

Cato thus came to represent, more than any other person (even more than Cicero), the *idea* of what Rome once was before the transformation of Rome during the Principate.[24] The most salient aspect of this with regard to the present study is the fact that Cato's power to influence all those who came after him was mediated through the power of *memory*. Cato proved a particularly powerful memory too.[25] Shortly after his death, Cicero—clearly not as compliant to the victorious Caesar as the latter had hoped—composed a pamphlet (unfortunately lost) praising Cato both for his inspiring standard of

[23] Cato's death in fact comes to be considered as the very model of a virtuous "Roman death" or *Romana mors*, to use Martial's phrase (1.78.7). Edwards, for example, opens her recent study *Death in Ancient Rome* (2007: 1) with Cato, whose death she names "the archetypal Roman death."

[24] Edwards (2007: 3): "Cato's death confirms the value, and marks the end, of all that the republic stood for."

[25] For a survey of the remarkable after-life of the Cato legend, see Goar (1987) and Dempsey (1961).

virtus and his principled opposition to Caesar.[26] Caesar, sensing that Cato in death might prove a more formidable foe than in life, quickly responded with his own *AntiCato* in which he tried to undercut the growing legend by reminding his fellow Romans of some of the historical Cato's shortcomings.[27] This was not, however, the Cato that people chose to remember. In the memory wars that thus began over how the end of the Republic would be remembered, the battle over Cato's memory was one that Caesar was destined to lose.[28] Much of the praise focused on Cato's philosophical embodiment of Stoic ideals.[29] For those, however, who still looked for a way to oppose Caesar and his near-universal hold on power, the Cato legend also took on a serious political dimension. Cicero's succinct formulation regarding Cato that *moriendum potius quam tyranni vultus aspiciendus fuit* (*De Off.* 1.112) shows that his suicide was a public declaration both of Stoic *constantia* and resistance to what was seen as the advent of tyranny under Caesar.[30] Even while those opposed to Caesar's consolidation of power had to accept the new reality at Rome, Cato and his suicide came to be remembered as a supreme *exemplum* of *continued* resistance against the new regime.[31]

---

[26] Through this work Cicero proved to be the primary catalyst for the launching of the Cato legend. Tacitus (*Ann*. 4.34) called it a book *quo Catonem caelo aequavit*; cf. Plutarch *Caesar* 54.5-6. For what we know of the text itself, see Kumaniecki (1970).

[27] This text is also lost; Tschiedel (1981) surveys the extant fragments and citations in other authors. Hirtius, one of Caesar's officers, also composed a polemic against Cato, apparently in support of Caesar.

[28] Cf. Goar (1987: 17), "As for the *Anti-Cato* itself, it failed utterly to destroy the Cato myth, in spite of Caesar's accusations… In fact, the *Anti-Cato* tended to confirm the myth."

[29] Cicero names him *perfectus mea sententia Stoicus* in the opening of his *Paradoxa Stoicorum* (2). A few generations later, Seneca declared him to be the very model of the wise man: *Catonem autem certius exemplar sapientis uiri nobis deos inmortalis dedisse quam Vlixem et Herculem prioribus saeculis* (*De Constantia* 2.1).

[30] On this passage see Edwards (2007: 148).

[31] Cf. Edwards (2007: 3): "Cato's death was rapidly taken as emblematic of Roman striving to place liberty above life—a death which marked the end of the republic yet also served as a testament to the value some

The image of Cato as an opponent to Caesar is evident in the famous *synkrisis* scene in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* (51-4), written less than twenty years after Cato's suicide. Sallust develops a character sketch of both men and closes with praise for the different virtues possessed by each (53-4). Cato is lauded for his *integritate vitae*, *contantia*, and *severitas* which only added to his *dignitas* (54). Sallust famously sums up his sketch of Cato by stating that *esse quam videri bonus malebat* (54).[32] Horace painted Cato in laudable terms, and Vergil placed Cato notably on the shield of Aeneas in juxtaposition to the rebellious Catiline, thus emphasizing his nobility on behalf of the Republic.[33] Augustus himself, whose position was that he had restored the Republic, tactfully chose not to follow Caesar's example and instead accepted the Cato legend, albeit in a limited fashion.[34] Manilius with his Stoic inclinations placed Cato's soul among those that inhabit the Milky Way and significantly names him *Cato fortunae victor* (1.797). Manilius later references him again as *invictum devicta morte Catonem* (4.87), evidence that by this time Cato as an idealized figure in the Roman imagination had been elevated to the status of *victor*, despite the historical fact that he fought on the losing side.

Romans at least placed on its ideals." Cf. also Batstone and Damon (2006: 170ff) on the early growth of the Cato legend.

[32] Goar (1987: 21) concludes that in Sallust's portrayal, "Cato is the vigorous and successful defender of the Republic against its enemies; in the comparison he is a revered figure, above reproach and above objective evaluation. His virtues are those cherished qualities—common in the men of old—which, according to Sallust, were the foundation of Rome's greatness. We are well on the way to that canonization of Cato which we find in Lucan a century later."

[33] Horace *Carm*. 1.12.35-6, 2.1.24; *Epist*. 1.19.13-4; Vergil *Aen*. 8.670.

[34] The emphasis placed on the term *res publica* in the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* illustrates Augustus' rhetorical positioning on what his ultimate victory meant for Rome; see especially 1.1, 1.4, 34.1. Cf. also Zanker (1988: 89ff) and Eder (2005). Suetonius writes that Augustus composed his own work on Cato late in life (*rescripta Bruto de Catone*, *Augustus* 85.1), but we do not firmly know its contents or how it portrayed him.

As the legend continued to grow, Cato proved especially popular in the rhetorical schools of the first century AD, where he—specifically his suicide on behalf of *Libertas*—became one of the stock subjects.[35] Here too we find him mentioned in the ranks of those who, though seemingly defeated, in fact emerge victorious. In *Suasoria* 6, on the subject of whether Cicero should beg Antony to spare his life, the elder Seneca has a certain Haterius proclaim that Cicero should do so since the days of Cato and Scipio are over:

> M. Cato, solus maximum vivendi moriendique exemplum, mori maluit quam rogare—nec erat Antonium rogaturus—et illas usque ad ultimum diem puras a civili sanguine manus in pectus sacerrimum armavit. Scipio, cum gladium [in] pectus abdidisset, quaerentibus qui in navem transierant militibus imperatorem "imperator" inquit "bene se habet." Victus vocem victoris emisit. (*Suasoria* 6.2)
>
> Marcus Cato, alone the greatest model of how to live and how to die, preferred death over begging for his life, and he did not face begging an Antony. And so he armed those hands—which even up to his final day remained pure from civil war's bloodshed—and struck his own most sacred breast. And when Scipio had also plunged a sword into his breast, he spoke in reply to those who had boarded the ship to look for him, "The general is well." Though vanquished he spoke with a victor's voice.

These two examples are meant to be read together, such that *victus vocem victoris emisit* contextually can apply to Cato as well. Valerius Maximus, in his lengthy compilation of *exempla* (suitable for rhetorical exercises), also portrays Cato in glowing terms.[36] On the subject of *Fortitudo* (bravery) Valerius invokes Cato's suicide, stating that Utica stood as a monument to the illustrious death of Cato, from whose "bravest wounds" poured forth

[35] E.g. Seneca Maior *Contr*. 10.1.8, 10.3.5. Cf. Goar (1987: 30-1).

[36] E.g. 2.10.8, 6.2.5.

not so much mere blood as glory itself.[37] Cato also had a special place in the writings of Seneca, who mentions him often; he used him, however, more as an *exemplum* of Stoic virtue and approaching death well than as an *exemplum* of political resistance, a fact that most likely reflects cautious expediency on Seneca's part under Nero.[38]

Background to Lucan's *Bellum Civile*

It is at this point, during the tumultuous reign of Nero, that Marcus Annaeus Lucanus (AD 39–65) enters the stage to place the memory of both the Civil War itself as a subject and Cato as a figure of ideological, political resistance before his audience. One of the most remarkable things about the *Bellum Civile* is that he composed the epic to ten books while still a young man, for he was to die before the end of his 26th year. The facts of his life are muddled, but we are confident on some of the key details.[39] Due to family connections with the imperial court (Seneca was his uncle), he became well-known to Nero who counted him among his friends (*cohortique amicorum additus*, Suet. *Vita Lucani*), and he served as both quaestor and augur at an early age. The lives state that he wrote numerous works, with the *Bellum Civile* clearly his *magnum opus*. He is said to have had a falling out with Nero in the midst of composing his epic (after the first three books), which led to an increasingly entrenched view against the tyranny of Nero. Politically he is most famous for joining the doomed Pisonian Conspiracy of AD 65 that

---

[37] Valerius Maximus 3.2.14: *Tui quoque clarissimi excessus, Cato, Utica monumentum est, in qua ex fortissimis vulneribus tuis plus gloriae quam sanguinis manavit*.

[38] E.g. *De Constantia* 2.2, *Ep*. 24.7-8. For an overview of Seneca's various uses of Cato in his writings, see Alexander (1946). I will engage more fully with Seneca's writings on Cato in Chapter 5 when I examine the speech by Brutus from Book 2.

[39] There are three lives of Lucan that survive, one attributed to Seutonius, another to Vacca, and one that remains anonymous (in the Codex Vossianus). They are printed in Hosius's edition of Lucan (Leipzig 1905). The *Vita* by Suetonius is clearly defective with various conjectures on possible lacunae, but its tone is generally hostile towards Lucan. Statius also offers a few cursory details in his laudatory poem *Genathliacon Lucani* (*Silvae* 2.7).

was formed to overthrow Nero.[40] When it was discovered, Lucan along with the other conspirators was ordered to commit suicide.[41]

It will be useful at this point to provide a brief sketch of the events described in Lucan's epic. The action begins with Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon River in 49 BC and proceeds through his conquest of Italy to his decisive victory over Pompey at the Battle of Pharsalus in 48 BC. Lucan then narrates in succession Pompey's beheading in Egypt, Cato's heroic march through the African desert at the head of the remnants of Pompey's broken armies, and Caesar's subsequent arrival in Egypt later the same year. The epic ends abruptly in the Tenth Book when Caesar is fighting with the upstart Ptolemy in Egypt, likely evidence that Lucan was unable to finish his work before Nero ordered him to commit suicide. Stylistically, Lucan fills in the events he describes with all manner of conceptual commentary, frequently in the form first person apostrophes.[42] In its most basic formulation, the *Bellum Civile* as a Roman epic depicts the very death of Rome, specifically the "Old Rome" that existed before the Caesars. The ideological battle that ultimately emerges is, to use Lucan's words, that between *Libertas et Caesar* (7.696). *Caesar* of course could mean "Nero"—a fact concerning which Lucan was certainly well aware. This negative-by-association portrayal of Nero as a tyrant "Caesar" surely played into Lucan's eventual resistance to Nero and thus contributed to his

---

[40] Suetonius writes that Lucan was practically the flag-bearer of the conspiracy (*ad extremum paene signifer Pisonianae coniurationis exstitit*).

[41] The *Vita Lucani* of Vacca reads at this point much like an obituary: *sua sponte coactus vita excedere venas sibi praecidit periitque pridie Kal. Maias Attico Vestino et Nerva Siliano coss. XXVI aetatis annum agens*. Cf. also the account of Tacitus *Ann*. 15.70.

[42] The sheer prevalance of such apostrophes are one of Lucan's most notable stylistic features. The question of how we should read these intruding voices into the narrative is one of the more significant interpretive questions for any reader of Lucan. For recent discussions of this question, see Leigh (1997: 307-10) and Behr (2007), for whom a study of Lucan's use of apostrophe drives her entire book.

Lucan's own ultimate demise. An unfortunate consequence of his early death is the fact that the *Bellum Civile* remains unfinished, coming to a close in what appears to be the middle of the tenth book. It is thus impossible to be entirely sure where or how Lucan intended to end his work or what scenes he would have included along the way. Most scholars today, however, agree that Lucan would have continued on to include at least a treatment of Cato's famous suicide at Utica, a view with which I agree.[43]

This point is significant for the present study since it assumes that Lucan intended to include the famous suicide of Cato in his epic narrative. Without knowing what sort of treatment the suicide would have received or what meaning Lucan would have invested it with, with respect to Lucan's overall depiction of Cato we are able only to make arguments based on the incomplete evidence we have. Lucan structures Cato into his epic in the context of this central battle over between *Libertas* and *Roma*. Yet, although he stands as one of the three major characters in the poem, Cato only appears as a character in two places, Books Two and Nine. Lucan introduces him in Book 2 (2.234–325) when Brutus seeks him out at home to ask what side he will choose in the civil war. His reply is that although he will nominally join Pompey's faction, his real cause lies with defending and memorializing *Libertas* on behalf of Rome. After remarrying Marcia in an austere wedding ceremony (2.326–391), remarkably nothing more is heard from him for the entirety of the next six books. It is only after Pompey has been beheaded that Cato reemerges from the background to rally the broken remnants of the Senatorial

---

[43] On this vexed question, see the discussion (and bibliography) of Roche (2005: 55-6) and Stover (2008: 571-2). Masters (1991: 247-59) is well-known for his argument that the ending we have is in fact the ending that Lucan planned, so as to project the pessimistic view that civil war is ultimately endless and without resolution. Masters's view, however, is not now commonly held; cf. Roche (2005: 56) who writes that Masters is "the last representative of the view that the poem is complete," although Henderson (1998: 170n22) in his revised version of "Lucan: the word at war" still hedges on Masters's proposal and ponders, "Was it Nero or Lucan or deathstiny that 'planned' Lucan's own end? Is *that* the *plot*?"

armies under a new banner—not that of a *dominus* such as Pompey or Caesar, but of *Libertas* herself (9.29–30). After a shipwreck along the African coast, Cato is forced to march his troops through the inhospitable desert sands of Libya (9.294–949). Along the way he encounters numerous dangers including sandstorms and a literal army of poisonous snakes that attack Cato's soldiers with lethal ferocity. After Cato's African ordeal comes to a close, Lucan turns his attention back to Caesar once more. Cato does not return—at least in the epic such as Lucan left it—although the themes most closely associated with his character factor heavily into the epic even while he is absent, and the knowledge of his coming suicide continues to loom large in the minds of every reader, both past and present.

Survey of Scholarship

Lucan's epic proved immensely popular both in antiquity and the Middle Ages, to the extent that Conte names it as "one of the great successes of world literature."[44] Shortly after Lucan's own death, Statius seems to have found inspiration in the epic sufficient to write a poem (*Silvae* 2.7, also called the *Genathliacon Lucani*) to Lucan's widow in honor of the dead poet's birthday.[45] Finding a different kind of inspiration, Petronius appears to have mocked it when he places in the mouth of Eumolpus a mini-epic on the civil wars that is almost certainly interacting with Lucan's work.[46] Quintilian includes it in his list of "classics" worth reading, famously adding that in his opinion

[44] Conte (1994: 449).

[45] In this poem, composed within a generation of Lucan's death, Statius praises the *Bellum Civile* and includes at one point brief descriptions of Lucan's three major characters. For Cato, he writes *libertate gravem pia Catonem* (2.7.68). Statius's poem is significant in that it illustrates how contemporary readers identified *Libertas* as the main theme or cause associated with Lucan's Cato.

[46] Petronius 119-124.

Lucan "*magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus*."[47] The *BC* continued to be read widely into the medieval period not only for its powerful and moving rhetoric but increasingly also as a source for history, geography, and natural phenomena (most notably astronomy and occult practice); its popularity is attested by the 164 extant manuscripts of Lucan copied already by the end of the 12th century, along with multiple surviving collections of scholia.[48] Notably, Lucan's narrative proved powerful enough for Dante to place Cato as the guardian of Purgatory (*Purgatorio* 1.31ff) and to include Lucan with Homer, Vergil, and Ovid as one of the four *spiriti magni* (*Inferno* 4.85). In the Renaissance up through the French Revolution, the epic was admired for its striking poetic pathos but perhaps made its greatest mark through its political ideology, as many readers found themselves deeply moved by the image of the noble Cato holding high the torch of Liberty against the inevitable onset of the tyrannical Caesar.[49] The epic continued to provide character models and poetic inspiration for such works as Petrarch's *Africa*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and Addison's *Cato*. Lucan's political dimension was particularly strong during this period, when the epic was in turn lauded as a manual for free citizens by Hugo Grotius and banned as a dangerous influence by Louis XIV.[50]

The last 125 years of scholarship on Lucan (and thus on his treatment of Cato) bears witness to a wide range of methodological approaches which in recent decades

---

[47] Quintilian, 10.1.90.

[48] On the medieval tradition of Lucan, Gotoff (1971) provides a good overview of the early main manuscripts. The published scholia collections are the *Commenta Bernensia* (ed. Usener 1869), *Adnotationes super Lucanum* (ed. Endt 1909), and the *Glosule super Lucanum* attributed to Arnulfus (ed. Marti 1958). On the scholia tradition, see Werner (1994).

[49] Eduard Fraenkel (1924; recently translated into English in Tesoriero (2010)) provides a marvelous overview of Lucan's admirers during the Middle Ages up through the Renaissance and even later as part of his study on Lucan's special emphasis on pathos as a successful feature of his style.

[50] See Conte (1994: 451).

have managed to produce conclusions that are at times polar opposites of each other.[51] The modern era of scholarship can be said to have begun with the publication in 1887 of Haskins' edition of Lucan's text accompanied by an extensive introduction by W.E. Heitland. Heitland reflected the general scholarly concerns of the time when he focused upon two key issues of literary interpretation that drove much of the early scholarship: 1) identifying who the *real* hero of the epic is, and 2) figuring out to what extent the *BC* was really an epic poem worth reading as poetry and not an overly-rhetoricized epic failure. For his part, Heitland suggested that Caesar was the real hero in traditional terms but that Cato was a kind of secondary moral hero; subsequent authors selected different figures, but most tended to lean toward Cato as at the least a kind of "spiritual hero" or even the allegorical abstraction of Stoic *Virtus* itself.[52] Regarding the second question, Fraenkel (1924) began the slow turn in favor of the poet by arguing that Lucan's rhetorical style was not a mark of "silver" decadence (and thus perpetual second-rate taste) but a successful tool for conveying a powerful poetic voice. The situation was still bad enough, however, in 1939 for Snell to write an article entitled simply "Lucan" in which he openly pleads with his fellow classicists to give Lucan a try and see the literary virtues the epic possesses.[53] A few years later Marti (1945) wrote the highly influential article "The Meaning of the Pharsalia," but she still writes in an almost apologetic tone, agreeing

[51] Braund (2010) in her introduction to the recent volume on Lucan in the *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies* series offers a wonderful synthesis of Lucan scholarship over the past century. In what follows my survey will tend to focus on the scholarship that specifically impacts interpretations of Cato in the epic.

[52] Heitland (1887: lxii); see e.g. Duff (1927: 263) for his view of Cato as a "spiritual hero" and Marti (1945: 361) for her emphasis on Cato's Stoic virtues.

[53] Snell however automatically accepts that overall Lucan falls short of real greatness, due to the three alleged faults of "irreverence, ghoulishness, and exaggeration" (84).

that Lucan "failed" because he was not up to the grandeur of his theme.[54] Yet Marti marked something of a permanent shift in Lucan's fortunes; her reading of the epic as a Stoic project to write epic largely based on the tenets of Stoic philosophy helped give critics an understandable starting point for approaching the epic. For her, Cato is the embodiment of the Stoic ideal of the *Sapiens*.[55] This approach towards interpreting Cato's success or failure through a primarily Stoic lens, however, has at times proved rather a hindrance when other aspects of Lucan's poetics are not taken into account.

Another long-standing quest of scholarship has been the identification of Lucan's political views and goals, a line of inquiry in which the political dimension of *Libertas* and thus Cato as the *exemplum Libertatis* is emphasized. Marti (1945) for example saw in Lucan by the end "the final call of the conspirator to a general rebellion" against a corrupt Principate, and in the succeeding decades scholars like Brisset (1964) continued to promote the idea that Lucan's political views (vis-à-vis his narrative's relationship with Libertas on one hand and the Principate on the other) were worth taking seriously.[56] Shortly after, Morford (1967) wrote that Cato inherits from Pompey the "cause of freedom and Rome"; elsewhere that same year Morford described Cato as Rome's true *pater patriae*.[57] Lintott (1971) also saw the epic as a call-to-arms against tyranny and read Lucan's Cato as the exemplar *par excellence*, while Dilke (1972) similarly advanced

---

[54] Marti (1945: 376).

[55] However, for the very reason of Cato's perfection Marti concludes (1945: 361) that "we find in him nothing lovable." Therefore, she offers Pompey as a figure more like the rest of humanity, a *proficiens* trapped in the middle of a bad situation and yet able to make good choices that will move him eventually to what she sees as his successful *apotheosis* in Book 9.

[56] Marti (1945: 375); Brisset (1964: 82) notably identifies the thoughts given to Cato as matching those of Lucan's own narrative voice: "A la lumière des principes qui dirigent les actions de ces deux homes dans la *Pharsale*, il paraît possible d'expliquer la pensée de l'auteur sous tous ses aspects."

[57] Morford (1967a: 9; 1967b: 126).

the view (increasingly the standard one) that Cato's opposition to Caesar represented the poet's own feelings toward the whole institution of the Principate. Greater attention was also being paid to the impressive complexity of Lucan's rhetoric and poetic structure, discussed for example by Lebek (1976) who placed the epic firmly within its historical context and analyzed the structural outline of much of the poem.[58]

The 1970's proved to be the next crucial turning-point in Lucan scholarship, for it would see the publication of two works largely responsible for Lucan's full reentry into the scholarly mainstream by the end of the decade. In 1970 Werner Rutz edited a volume on Lucan in the *Wege der Forschung* series in which he gathered together a number of significant articles published elsewhere (along with some excerpts from unpublished dissertations) and translated them as necessary into German, essentially making available to fellow scholars a single compendium of some of the best thought on Lucan up to that date.[59] Then in 1976, Frederick Ahl wrote his pivotal book on Lucan that essentially changed the landscape and revived critical interest (especially among English-language scholars) by presenting a clear, cogent discussion of Lucan's poetics and epic purpose that analyzed not just a part of the epic but the entirety of the work as a comprehensive whole. Ahl rigorously argued that Cato's portrayal is best explained by the view that Lucan wanted to glorify the *losing* side rather than the winning side in the Roman Civil War. Since the gods in an epic would be culpable for deciding the victor, Lucan thus removed them, leaving Caesar alone as the target of blame against whom the moral

---

[58] Regarding Cato, Lebek (1976: 181-2) constructs a detailed outline of the Book 2 speeches by Brutus and Cato that is in many respects similar to my own (done independently before I looked at Lebek), thus supporting much of my rhetorical argumentation.

[59] Rutz (1970: 1) opens the introduction to the volume by lamenting, "Lucan steht dem heutigen Gebildeten fern," with regard to the comparative neglect that Lucan has suffered in his generation, especially in German scholarship. His work significantly revived the serious study of Lucan in Germany.

superiority of Cato would shine all the more vividly. I find Ahl generally compelling and very often convincing in his assessments, but his reading of the text can frequently be too straightforward and lacks engagement with some of Lucan's problematic poetics, as subsequent scholars have made clear. Ahl represented something of a high point for the traditionalist (fairly non-theoretical) approach to Lucan in which Lucan's Republican sympathies and the successful elevation of Cato's noble virtues were taken for granted.

Following this lead, Narducci (1979) published a work that maintained a strong sense of Lucan's poetics as a successor (and competitor) to Vergil and also maintained the traditional pride of place for Cato as a representation of Lucan's own eventual pro-liberty and anti-Caesarian feelings.[60] Martindale (1984) saw in Lucan two kinds of *libertas*, political and personal, with Cato proving that the latter may still live on even when the former is defeated and lost in Lucan's own day. George (1991) more optimistically read Cato's actions as revealing Lucan's own desire to embrace true Republicanism.[61] Of particular importance is Quint (1992) who accurately placed Lucan against Vergil as the model of all the "epics of the defeated, a defeated whose resistance contains the germ of a broader republican or antimonarchial politics."[62] Quint goes on to argue persuasively that one of the key characteristics to Lucan is that of ongoing struggle against *Caesar*, a theme that will be key to my own interpretation of Lucan's Cato. The common denominator in virtually all of the scholarship up to this point had been how people read Lucan's poetry and his characters: most studies were traditionalist/historicist

---

[60] Peter Toohey (2000: 451) in a review article of a related book on Neronian literature characterizes Narducci's approach as one of "ideologically driven historicism" in that he tends to interpret through the lens of Lucan's assumed political anti-Caesarism.

[61] George (1991: 257).

[62] Quint (1992: 8).

in their approach (without openly applying theoretical critiques) and Cato was taken at face value in Lucan as an intended object of triumphant virtue. Cato certainly was universally read positively as someone who, whatever his role in the epic, clearly embodied *Libertas* and *Virtus* in a fairly unproblematic fashion, and in this they were following the path established initially by the laudatory depictions of Cato put forward by the Romans themselves.[63]

A dramatic new direction in Lucan scholarship, however, appeared in 1987 with the publication of Ralph Johnson's *Momentary Monsters* and John Henderson's "Lucan: The Word at War." Moving beyond the old debates over political messages, Johnson and Henderson argued, each in their separate ways (Johnson with a more formalist, close-reading approach and Henderson with his full-blown deconstructive reading) that the whole epic—much like an actual civil war—was a literary exercise in irony, in horrific absurdity.[64] Others quickly followed in this new path, notably Masters (1992), Hardie (1993) and Martindale (1993).[65] Taking on a new set of assumptions informed by more

---

[63] The Lucan volume of ANRW (32.5) appeared in 1985, in which Rutz (1985) offered a (still-useful) comprehensive bibliographic essay, representing the state of scholarship right on the threshold of the more-pessimistic views of Johnson and Henderson entering the discussion. I do not mean to suggest that scholars were unaware of problematic elements to Lucan's unique poetic style, but rather that virtually everybody agreed that Lucan's poem at least elevated the virtue of Cato.

[64] To quote a line from Henderson's 1998 revision of this article: "The ideology forged to bridge from the order of the City of Rome to that of the imperial World State is exposed as a schizo drivenness, as the cult of aggression and 'Oneness' leads to a logical end in suicidal implosion. And Lucan offers no remedy, no alternative promise" (168).

[65] Masters has proven deeply influential on subsequent scholarship with his well-argued illustrations of ways in which Lucan self-consciously manipulates and fragments language itself and the expectations of language. It is interesting, however, that in Masters' discussion Cato is practically invisible, once again the victim of a selective reading of Lucan's text. Hardie and Martindale consciously utilize a blend of more recent theoretical and intertextual approaches to suggest the multiple levels at which a text is "implicated" in the creation of competing messages. Such an approach (perhaps predictably) leads them toward a more pessimistic view of Cato's ability to retain his virtue intact by the end of the epic; cf. Hardie's conclusion (1993: 11) regarding Cato: "Eventually, after the present ending of the poem, Cato will die as literally the 'one man', as the last Republican, the sole survivor of his race. What will be left will be Caesar—everything but nothing, the living corpse of Rome."

openly deconstructivist readings of the epic, these scholars arrived at the striking conclusions that Lucan openly problematized or even *denied* a Stoic order to the cosmos, that the epic does not intend sincerely to elevate any character, and that Lucan sets up Cato specifically to become a parody of the Stoic *sapiens* who in the end is revealed to be a spectacular failure. I do not agree with the fundamentally pessimistic premise put forward by such scholars, for I hold that Lucan's epic puts forward at least the possibility of a hopeful outlook. However, I do agree with many of their critiques of what had often been overly-simplistic readings of Lucan by previous scholars. Lucan studies in general is indebted to this new theoretically-informed approach at the least for showing that inherently subversive rhetorical tendencies lie embedded within the epic text to such a degree that they can hardly be accidental. Specifically, the new theoretical tools illustrated all the more clearly the inner competition that exists in the text between Caesarian authority and active resistance to it. Shadi Bartsch (1998), taking up many of these contemporary arguments but coming to different conclusions, advocated for something like a middle ground; in her view the epic does in fact possess an ideological center, but a subjective one—in a world devoid of meaning, we must all *choose* how we make positive sense out of chaos. Matthew Leigh (1997), also attempting to find some resolution to the competing voices, accurately points out the tension built into the text by Lucan between encountering the epic text as an act of spectating (disengagement) or as an act of emotional and ethical participation (engagement). The marshalling of convincing evidence for the presence of competing voices within the epic is in my opinion one of the more constructive benefits to come from developments in scholarship

over the past two decades, and this view will ultimately factor strongly in my own approach to Cato's role in the epic.

Yet with regard to Cato, the tendency within this group has been toward a pessimistic view radically different from the time of Ahl. Leigh (1997) reads Lucan as intentionally portraying Cato as a "comic failure," particularly in Book 9, which ironically serves not to elevate Cato's virtue but rather to depict a "virtue defeated."[66] Hershkowitz (1998) also concludes that Cato's power as an *exemplum virtutis* to his beleaguered soldiers in Africa is but a hollow pretense.[67] Salemme (2002) sees a teleological bent in Lucan's epic toward ruin that is unavoidable, summing up, "La storia va, implacabile, verso la rovina"; he allows that Cato can be virtuous, but it is isolated in such a ruinous world and ultimately devoid of most influence to improve anything or impact others.[68] Recently, Sklenář (1999) has expressed the extreme position of this view in arguing that Lucan has constructed an "unrecanted nihilistic cosmology" which exposes the rigid Stoic values of Cato as worthless.[69] These essentially postmodern (or at least overtly "problematizing") approaches to the text have gained tremendous momentum over the past decade, such that it is now something of a new standard, at least within English-language scholarship.[70]

---

[66] Leigh (1997: 267).

[67] Hershkowitz (1998: 243).

[68] Salemme (2002: 74).

[69] Sklenář (1999: 293). He has developed his arguments further in his book *The Taste for Nothingness. A Study of Virtus and Related Themes in Lucan's* Bellum Civile (2003). While I generally agree regarding the threats posed by a subversive world of civil war to the viability of ethics and *virtus*, I cannot agree with his nihilistic outlook on the poem. In respect to this and his negative view of Cato, Sklenář represents almost the opposite of my views.

[70] One fairly unique "pessimistic" reading is that offered by De Nadaï (2000) who argues that Lucan intentionally subverts the ability of his poetics to engage in the Aristotelian ideal of *mimesis* such that he in

Perhaps not surprisingly, the pendulum of scholarship has simultaneously swung back a bit in recent years against the more pessimistic readings of Lucan. Some scholars still present a fairly positive Cato who stands as a genuine champion of *libertas* and who exhibits a real Stoic *virtus*. The most vocal of these is Emmanuele Narducci, one of the leading voices of Italian scholarship, who has repeatedly pushed back against what he terms (1999) the "decostruzionistica" tendencies in certain dominant trends of scholarship (which he associates with the Anglo-speaking world).[71] In his works from the past decade or so (1999, 2002) he defends the older, more positive view, maintaining that Lucan did not intend any kind of ironic reading on Cato (or the epic as a whole) and that any attempt to do so is a fundamental misreading of the poem.[72] To Narducci, Cato is still a serious moral exemplar who does manage to conquer his enemies in the poem on the philosophical rather than the physical plane. Throughout this period, German scholarship has by and large maintained its traditional, more formalist approach. Radicke (2004) maintains a positive view of Cato in his book on the influence of Livy's historical

---

the end becomes "anti-mimetic" (343). I find such a reading unconvincing, for its over-reliance upon an unwarranted "classical" Aristotelian standard for Lucan's poetics. Curiously, Nadaï represents one of the few major publications on Lucan in French scholarship over the past few decades. In his review (2003: 106) on Nadaï, Hunink (the leading voice of Dutch scholarship on Lucan) first contrasts the robust renaissance in scholarly interest elsewhere, and then writes, "Recent French Lucan studies, meanwhile, seem to belong to a different, peaceful world, one might almost say 'a world of their own', in which current international scholarly trends and issues are hardly even reflected. This was not always the case, but major studies on Lucan in French have dropped off significantly since the 1960s." More noteworthy is Loupiac (1998) who writes on what he sees as the epic's subtle engagement with the Stoic theories of the elements.

[71] Narducci (1999: 40).

[72] These recent works update Narducci's earlier writings and show more sophistication in his approach. He also pays more attention to recent theoretical approaches, although mostly to decry them as blinding the scholar to what he sees as the core ideas Lucan unproblematically intended to communicate. As will be clear below, I share most of Narducci's criticisms against the potential excesses of deconstructionist readings.

narrative on the compositional techniques of the epic.[73] This more optimistic view of Cato also happens to be shared by the three major commentaries on Book 9—all in German—that have appeared in the last decade (Raschle 2001, Wick 2004, Seewald 2008), all of them reading Cato as an authentic model of *Virtus*.[74]

In short, Lucan studies has enjoyed over the past few decades a full renaissance with numerous conferences, articles, monographs, and commentaries appearing with increasing frequency.[75] Strong evidence of this is the appearance of multiple edited volumes in the last decade or so, many of them collected papers from conferences. In 1999 the important volume *Interpretare Lucano* (Esposito and Nicastri, eds.) was published, giving voice to a new generation of Italian Lucan scholars.[76] The overall tone of the volume is one of "righting the ship" as it were, and it is here that Narducci makes his first forays against the pessimistic approach to Lucan studies.[77] Not long after

---

[73] He takes Cato at face value: "Cato verkörpert in der Pharsalia den Typus des stoischen Weisen" (140). He concludes that Cato possesses "drei Rollenmuster, die in seiner Figur zusammenfallen: (1) der epische Held, (2) die historische Person, (3) der stoische Weise." (148)

[74] To cite one example for each of their positive readings of Cato or reaction against pessimistic readings: Raschle (2001: 56): "Fur Lucan zählt in einem nach Pharsalus endgültig sinnlos und absurd gewordenen Krieg nur noch die Bewährung des Einzelnen, die er in Cato als Leitbild aufzeigt. In der Fortführung dieses Gedankens müsste dann auch der Freitod Catos nicht als Untergang, sondern als Sieg der *virtus* über die *Fortuna* bewertet warden." Seewald (2008: 28): "Ungeachtet der Idealisierung verbleibt Cato damit in der Sphäre des Irdischen; er wird zu einem historischen Exempel des Kampfes gegen einen Tyrannen und fordert den Leser, der unter der Herrschaft des Nero lebt, zur Nachfolge auf. Er ist nicht eine unerreichbare mythische Gestalt der Vorzeit wie der pius Aeneas Vergils." And finally Wick (2004: I.32): "Diese ikonoklastisch-dekonstruktive Lesart von Lukans Text bewertet die Catofigur mit Maßstäben, für die sie nicht geschaffen wurde, was jedenfalls sehr problematisch erscheint und als interpretatorische Fehlentwicklung einzustufen ist."

[75] Braund (2010: 12) lists no less than five major international conferences solely devoted to Lucan and his influence since 2001.

[76] All but two of the articles are in Italian; the exceptions are from the well-known English scholars Fantham and Leigh.

[77] In his review on this work, Hunink (2002: 69) writes: "As a whole, the volume is more than an aimless mélange of scholarly exercises, and can even be seen as the embodiment of a programmatic statement: 'Lucanean studies must get back to normal.'" Here, "normal" is meant as a push-back against what are

Esposito and Ariemma (2004) helped edit another volume on Lucan, this one the result of an international conference in Italy. A third edited volume appeared in 2005, edited by Christine Walde, this one the result of a conference in Germany. In contrast to much of the rest of continental German scholarship up to that time, many of the papers here (most in German) take a more pessimistic and deconstructionist viewpoint, and Cato is frequently read in the vein of a Stoic whose success is made impossible by Lucan.

A number of recent studies, however, take a more positive view of Cato while taking his analysis in welcome, fruitful directions, some of them by way of multidisciplinary approaches. Hill (2004), employing the tools of sociology, discusses Lucan's Cato through the lens of his suicide, calling Cato's famous suicide at Utica a positive act of moral witness of his ideals before the community at large (18) and naming Cato himself the "center of moral gravity in Lucan's poem" (222).[78] Behr (2007) takes up the presence of competing voices in the text and puts forward convincing arguments that seek to show how the intruding narrator's voice—which incidentally comes closest to the ideas also put into the mouth of Cato—corresponds best to Lucan's own voice and is used functionally to navigate the reader through the text's otherwise subversive poetics of a world trapped in civil war. I find his more positive reading of Lucan's epic voice to be a welcome corrective to the trend toward finding absurdity lurking behind every episode. Coffee (2008) has recently argued for a new reading of Lucan through the lens of socio-economic exchange and its attendant ethical dimensions; he sees Lucan

---

seen to be the excesses of postmodern theoretical approaches that threaten the ability of literary scholarship to make any kind of definitive, meaningful statement about a text.

[78] Hill (2004: 222) goes on to say, "However unengaging and remote he might seem to modern readers, he is the only figure in Lucan's work who participates in the action of the poem unscathed by the polluting *nefas* of civil war."

imprinting on Cato the positive and inherently Roman quality of frugality. This is a welcome development since it helps us read Cato as governed not only by ideals of Stoic philosophy but just as equally by ethical codes of exchange that point to Cato's identity being more *Roman* than merely Stoic. And Stover (2008) comes to Cato's defense as a person whom Lucan meant for us to take seriously and argues for the epic taking on a "Catonian perspective" after Book 8, concluding rightly that if Lucan had not meant to make Cato into a genuine focal point of resistance to the Caesars and their tyranny, then there would have been no point in continuing the epic after Pharsalus and Pompey's death.[79]

Most importantly for this study, Gowing (2005) applies recent interdisciplinary study on the phenomena of cultural memory to a study of Roman literature from the late Republic and Principate. He reads Lucan as an author who is attempting to shape a specific kind of memory of the Civil Wars (and contest competing memories, such as those promoted by the Caesars), suggesting that Lucan has a specific set of encoded messages about the meaning of Rome's past that he desires his audience to "remember" with him. Gowing clearly shows how for the Romans memory was "rooted in the link between death and life," a fact illustrated by the cultural significance of Rome's numerous memory institutions, ranging from ancestral wax imagines to funeral monuments to the tradition of moral *exempla*.[80] In Gowing's reading, civil war threatens the viability of cultural memory as the culture is thrown into upheaval. He sees Caesar as

---

[79] Stover (2008: 576): "The logic of Lucan's narrative is such that without the presence of Cato, the sole champion of *libertas* in the poem, the triumph of tyranny would already be complete and there would be no reason either to fight – or to write – the *bellum civile*."

[80] Gowing (2005: 12). I will develop in fuller detail the centrality of such memory institutions to my approach to interpreting Lucan and his treatment of Cato in the next three chapters.

a "destroyer of memory" and Cato as a preserver of memory, as he becomes in Lucan a living *exemplum* of virtue but even more of resistance.[81] One of Gowing's most welcome advancements is in his expansion of memory studies beyond the age of Augustus into post-Vergilian literature, which is clearly seen to be constantly engaging with both the republican past as well is its Augustan literary predecessors. As will soon become clear, his approach has blazed a trail that I have followed in the present study, and his conclusions have been tremendously influential upon my own arguments.[82] This present study seeks to advance the work of Gowing in two main areas. First, I focus exclusively upon Lucan's engagement with memory rather than needing to treat the entire period of the early Principate, a benefit of greater focus that allows me to engage Lucan's text in a more detailed and systematic fashion. Second, I argue that we can read the entire epic itself as possessing the rhetorical function of a funeral monument, with the result that the *Bellum Civile* as a whole mirrors the concerns over memory we see embedded in episodes throughout the text, especially in the episodes connected with Cato.

To summarize, Lucan scholarship—particularly so with respect to Cato—at the end of the first decade of the 21st century is roughly split into two camps: those who think the poem is driven (to one degree or other) by fragmentation of meaning, absurdity, or even meaninglessness, and those who more traditionally take Lucan's narrative at face

---

[81] Gowing (200: 84).

[82] Another exploration of memory in Lucan is found in Spencer (2005), who sees in Lucan an epic landscape of ruin and failing memory, primarily as a response to Nero's "imperial domination of the Roman landscape to such an extent that "historical meaning is so drained from Rome that the city is no longer at the heart of its own story" (48). Where I diverge from her is in her ultimately pessimistic view of the prospects for memory's survival under Nero. I instead take a more hopeful view by focusing on the potential power of a *monumentum* to preserve and renew memory—*especially* in the face of death.

value and read Cato in a more sincere, optimistic light.[83] An ongoing problem, however, has been the fact that hitherto very little constructive dialogue has existed between the two approaches, with the result that the strengths of each have not been combined in any constructive way. But I find shortcomings even in the conclusions from the more positive readings by Lucan scholars regarding Cato. To begin with, Cato usually appears in the scholarship as part of a larger thematic study and is *himself* almost never the focus of study. Efforts to interpret Cato's role and purpose within this epic story have also too often tended to focus their scope on Cato's perceived moral/philosophical greatness (or failure) as a Stoic *sapiens* and/or his political significance, but studies usually stop at this point and fail to go the next step and ask a crucial question: to what purpose is Cato being portrayed this way by this poem and by this poet? What does Lucan's Cato actually mean and accomplish for Lucan's *overall* poetic program which is ultimately aimed at his readers?[84]

Survey of Argumentation

The ongoing problems of interpretation regarding Lucan's treatment of Cato have not been properly addressed. For this reason, this dissertation will offer a new reevaluation, specifically targeted at addressing what it is exactly that Lucan sets Cato up to accomplish in this narrative. My approach in this dissertation will be interdisciplinary in that I will combine the tools of memory studies with a careful reading of key passages

[83] Hunink (2003: 106) in a review article summarizes the situation as follows: "Lucanean studies have now even led to a scholarly debate between followers of the radical (mostly English) and more conservative (continental) approaches." There are of course representatives of each view to be found among all groups.

[84] Ahl (1976), for example, sees Cato as the moral *victor* in spite of being the military *victus*, but what affect would such an ethically and politically charged depiction have upon an audience living under the reign of Nero? Elaine Fantham (1992: 34) also, in her astute commentary on Book 2, concludes that Cato's hope is to escape enslavement through a noble death, but her analysis goes no further.

through Lucan that shed light on the meaning and purpose of Cato in the epic. I will state up front that my interpretations fall more into the traditionalist/positive camp regarding Lucan's epic program. Although I do find many of the recent postmodern critiques helpful on Lucan overall, I do not find the pessimistic views of Cato convincing in their basic premises. Lucan's narrative style does reward a limited deconstructionist reading, but these approaches can often proceed so far in that direction that it becomes difficult to argue that Lucan actually *means* anything other than the frustration of meaning. It seems most unlikely that Lucan composed a whole epic at the age he did *primarily* to show off his rhetorical powers, clever patterns of intertexuality, and metapoetic interests. To be blunt, when I read Lucan, I read someone who is mad as hell and desperately wants to get his audience to pay attention so that he can tell them *something*.[85]

This dissertation will argue that this *something* has something to do with the power of memory. Memory has the power to preserve (and thus in a way resurrect) the dead. Accordingly, memory also has the power to maintain opposition to a foe by resurrecting its opponent. The single most powerful memorial to the Republic that passed away with Caesar's victory is the figure of Cato, and thus the power of the Cato legend upon subsequent generations always acted through the power of memory. Previous attempts to interpret Lucan's portrait of Cato, however, have rarely approached the subject through this lens. Gowing (2005) was one of the first, but his section on Cato is but one part of a larger study on post-Augustuan literature. In this study I will take the next step and provide a fuller analysis of Cato with respect to Lucan's engagement with the theme of memory. In Lucan's hands, Cato becomes more overtly a vehicle for the

[85] It is true he presents fragmented or competing voices, but I will argue that this is part of his poetic program.

power of memory, specifically a memory for Lucan's audience of a Rome that once existed before the Caesars and which possessed that fabled, long-lost *libertas*.

As a means to help focus my investigation, this dissertation will have at its core an analysis of the speech that Cato delivers in Book 2. This speech is crucial for understanding Lucan's portrayal of Cato in that it marks his first appearance as an actual character in the epic, and it is here that Cato makes a statement of intent regarding his desired role in the civil war and the desired goals he wishes to accomplish. To avoid the danger of reading Cato's speech in isolation, the first part of the dissertation will take the form of an investigation into the fuller context that informs our reading of the speech, and the last chapter will touch on the wider significance of Cato's reappearance when he finally returns in Book 9.[86] Starting in Chapter 2, I will analyze the epic's proem and examples throughout the rest of Book 1 to demonstrate that the nature of civil war is characterized by the programmatic subversion of victory into universal self-defeat. This central truth of Lucan's epic landscape is significant in that it stands as the chief threat to Cato's ability to accomplish anything successful through the power of memory in this epic on behalf of a defeated *libertas*. Chapter 3 will expand its focus into the narrative that bridges Books 1 and 2 in which Lucan depicts the fear-driven response of the people of Rome to imminent defeat (1.469-2.233). Such a response threatens their *libertas* as well as their collective memory of Rome's identity, signified by a breakdown in such core values as *pietas*. In Chapter 4, I will continue to explore the context for Cato's speech by focusing upon the scene immediately preceding his appearance, the dramatic

[86] It is worth stating up front that as this study took shape, it soon became clear that for space reasons I would not be able to do a complete analysis of Lucan's treatment of Cato, as a proper treatment of Cato's restoration of the army of Rome and his march through the African desert would require many further chapters of their own. Accordingly, this study aims at the more modest but still essential goal of understanding Lucan's full treatment of Cato up through his reappearance in Book 9.

flashback to the bloody purges of Marius and Sulla (2.67-233). This long act of memory which relates the most recent *exemplum* of Roman civil war illustrates that even though memory is present it is not producing any positive effect. I will explore further how Roman memory institutions such as the *exemplum* function and then show that this memory of Marius and Sulla fails to help preserve the identity of Rome but rather undermines it by leading the people of Rome into further despair through the flashback's suggestion of an endless cycle of civil war.

This narrative discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 stands in stark contrast to the subsequent narrative in Book 2 when Brutus and Cato enter the story and deliver their speeches. The content and significance of this pair of speeches will be the focus of the next two chapters. In Chapter 5, I will examine Brutus's speech (2.242-284), which argues that Cato would gain nothing for himself or for his country by his participation. Lucan has before him the important task of explaining what Cato as a supposed Stoic *sapiens* could hope to achieve by getting involved in the sordid *nefas* of Civil War, and thus it is essential to understand these ideas and challenges to which Cato's speech will directly respond. I will show that Brutus at first takes up numerous Stoic arguments against participation, particularly those found in the writings of Lucan's uncle Seneca, but that at the end of the speech Brutus declares that he would become the enemy of the *victor* once the civil war has been decided. This importantly suggests the concept of a second, ongoing war to be waged by the defeated against the winners. Chapter 6 will be a careful analysis of the text of Cato's speech itself, in which Cato refutes the standard Stoic assumptions and subsequently explains his own unique rationale for getting involved as an invested *Roman* first and foremost rather than as merely a good Stoic. I

will show that in this speech, Cato declares two desired goals for his participation. His first goal is to commemorate the dead, specifically the perishing ideal of *Roma et Libertas*, drawing upon the key simile of a grieving father who participates in the funeral of a deceased child. His second goal is to offer his life as a beneficial sacrifice, citing the example of the famed *devotio* of Decius Mus, an *exemplum* that is particularly significant in its image of a self-sacrifice that transforms personal defeat into a victory for Rome. In this way, Cato declares that it is not his goal to avoid defeat, for that would be impossible, but rather to employ the power of memory through his defeat for the lasting benefit of Rome.

In Chapter 7, I will assess the likelihood of Lucan's Cato accomplishing his two desired goals through an analysis of Cato's absence and subsequent reappearance in Book 9. He reappears only after Caesar is victorious and *Roma et Libertas* have been defeated, thus allowing Cato—who is himself the living *exemplum* of this ideal—to reemerge and begin waging the ongoing battle of resistance against Caesar and his tyranny. I will demonstrate that even though the epic does not include the full story arc of Cato's life up to his famous suicide, Book 9 establishes him as a figure who is able to restore the dying ideal of a free Rome back to life and transform his own eventual defeat into a lasting *monumentum* of that ideal which will live on into future generations—including those living in Lucan's own time. I will conclude with a brief discussion of the visit of Caesar to the ruined monuments of Troy near the end of Book 9, which illustrates the ongoing struggle over the survival of memory in an epic landscape and promotes the epic's own competing memory of what Rome once was. Through its portrait of Cato, the *Bellum*

Civile conveys the hope—however uncertain—that *Libertas* may once again return to Lucan's Rome.

CHAPTER 2
THE DEFEAT OF VICTORY

Cato's Mission

The core framework that will guide this study of Lucan's Cato is the mission statement he makes in his speech in Book 2 (2.284-325) in which he lays out two desired goals for his participation in this civil war. Since these goals create the framework for any analysis of Cato's role in this epic, they will be summarized up front.[1] First, in defending his participation as a natural outcome of his devotion to his country, Cato invokes a poignant funeral simile in which we see a grieving parent participating in his child's funeral.

> ceu morte parentem
> natorum orbatum longum producere funus
> ad tumulos iubet ipse dolor, iuvat ignibus atris
> inseruisse manus constructoque aggere busti
> ipsum atras tenuisse faces, non ante reuellar
> exanimem quam te complectar, Roma; tuumque
> nomen, Libertas, et inanem persequar umbram. (2.297-303)

> Just as grief itself bids a parent bereft by the death of his children to lead forth the long funeral procession to the burial mound—how good it feels to insert his hands into the black fires and, once the funeral pyre is built up, hold aloft the black torches himself—like this I will not be pulled away before I embrace you, *Roma*, in your death, nor before I pursue your name, *Libertas*, and your empty shade.

Just as such a father could not reasonably make any other choice than participate in the commemoration of his child's death, Cato too is driven to join in civil war. The crucial detail, however, is that Cato says he will enter civil war *not* to help wage it but to help commemorate what will perish because of it. This makes the nature of Cato's participation unique in the *Bellum Civile*. Cato declares what it is that will perish and

[1] A full analysis of this entire speech comes in Chapter 6, which develops the arguments for my reading in greater depth.

will thus be his purpose to commemorate: Rome and Liberty, *hendiadys* for the ideal of a free Rome.

Second, Cato acknowledges that he—indeed everbody—will experience defeat in civil war and expresses his desire that somehow his defeat could become a self-sacrifice that is beneficial for all of Rome, invoking as a parallel the famous *devotio* of Decius Mus.

> devotum hostiles Decium pressere catervae:
> me geminae figant acies, me barbara telis
> Rheni turba petat, cunctis ego pervius hastis
> excipiam medius totius vulnera belli. (2.308-11)

> Enemy throngs overwhelmed Decius during his *devotio*—let the twin armies pierce *me*, let the barbarian mob from the Rhine seek *me* out with their javelins, let me stand in the center to block all the spears and receive myself all the wounds of this war.

This *exemplum* is significant for Cato in that it offers a model in which a Roman leader willingly accepts a position of defeat in order to benefit his fellow Romans and thereby transform an assured defeat into a larger victory for Rome. When put together, the goal to become a beneficial self-sacrifice emerges as the tool for accomplishing the goal to commemorate the dead ideal of *libertas*. These are surely noble goals, but it remains to be seen whether or not they are possible for Cato in this tale. Lucan's epic will place many obstacles in his path to block his success, the most obvious of which is the fact that he and what he stands for must in fact come out of the civil war on the *losing* side.

Sed Victa Catoni (1.128)

This is made perfectly clear in the text at the point when Lucan first introduces Cato into the epic by name: *victrix causa deis placuit sed victa Catoni* (1.128).[2] This

[2] This passage, which Ahl (1976: 231), calls "Lucan's best-known line," has a robust *Nachleben* that includes its quotation by Boethius (*De Cons. Phil.* 4.6) and its appropriation by the social theorist Hannah

striking *sententia* declares from the beginning that Cato's identity will be built upon his devotion to the cause that was defeated. It stands as the final line of a coherent section, so it worthwhile to quote the whole passage:

> stimulos dedit aemula virtus.
> tu, nova ne veteres obscurent acta triumphos
> et victis cedat piratica laurea Gallis,
> Magne, times; te iam series ususque laborum
> erigit impatiensque loci fortuna secundi;
> nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarve priorem
> Pompeiusve parem. quis iustius induit arma
> scire nefas: magno se iudice quisque tuetur;
> victrix causa deis placuit sed victa Catoni. (1.120–128)

> (The excellence in each applied the goad as it strove with that of the other. You, Magnus, fear that *his* recent deeds will obscure your past triumphs, that your victories over pirates will yield to *his* conquered Gauls. And what directs your path, Caesar, are your long record of experience and accomplishments as well as a fortune impatient of second place. Neither can Caesar abide any longer a superior, nor can Pompey abide an equal. Who took up arms more justly? It is *nefas* to know. Each side looks to its own great judge: the victorious cause was pleasing to the gods, but the lost cause was pleasing to Cato.)

There is some ambiguity here, however, for the cause which found favor with Cato is not actually identified in the text. The context for this passage is the contest of wills between Caesar and Pompey, in which we are given insight into each man's motivations for engaging in civil war. This might create the initial impression that Cato's

---

Arendt (1978: 216) as a motto for her idea of historical "reclamation." More recently—and tellingly—it features as the inscription on the base of the Confederate Memorial, erected in 1914 in Arlington National Cemetery to honor those who died fighting for the *losing* side in the American Civil War. On this monument's promotion of southern "Lost Cause" ideology, see for example Blair (2004: 204-7). Given the line's acknowledged fame, it is striking that so few works of scholarship directly engage the line directly; Johnson (1987), Masters (1992), Leigh (1997), Henderson (1998), Sklenář (2003), and Behr (2007) for example never discuss this text in their studies. Ahl (1976) and Narducci (2002: 205-6, 387) are among the few who do engage this line; their views are summarized below. Even Ahl (1976: 232), however, moves quickly on from his initial discussion of this passage in writing, "Having thus presented Cato, briefly but memorably, Lucan moves on. Enough has been said to distinguish him from other characters." As will be demonstrated below, this line's depiction of Cato set up in *ongoing* opposition to the victorious cause is deeply significant for understanding Cato's function within the epic and yet remains largely overlooked.

causa is simply that of the defeated Pompey.[3] The text of the passage points to something more universal in scope, however. Cato's appearance in 1.128 fits into the specific context of the question and answer posed in 1.126–8. By virtue of asking which side took up arms more justly (*iustius*), Lucan elevates these final three lines beyond the immediate political contest between Caesar and Pompey into the more abstract realm of a moral commentary on the waging of the civil war itself.[4] Cato is himself elevated to a position of judge set opposite the gods, a status that marks him as a moral authority on the war's outcome. In sum, this Cato at 1.128 is not so much the historical character as the abstract representation of a moral ideal that goes beyond merely that of a defeated political faction. Anybody familiar with the Cato legend in the Principate would know that the moral idea Cato most represented was in fact Roman *libertas*, the ideal of a free Rome with senatorial self-determination such as existed before the civil wars brought the Caesars to stay.[5] As we read through the rest of the epic, Cato fully confirms this view three times: in his Book 2 speech quoted at the beginning of this chapter when he claims *libertas* as the perishing ideal he seeks to commemorate (2.303), later in Book 7 after

---

[3] This was once a standard view, e.g. Getty (1940: 127): "Caesar's side was supported by Heaven and Pompey's by Cato."

[4] Ahl (1976: 244–5) recognizes this moral focus, concluding that Cato's introduction here serves primarily to distinguish his motives from those of the passive, uncaring gods and to portray him as a champion of the morally right. Cf. also Lebek (1976: 62): "Zugleich wird mit der Sentenz ein Monument der sittlichen Größe Catos geschaffen, dessen Name am Ende des gesamten Abschnitts…einen markanten Platz einnimmt."

[5] One need only turn, for example, to the works of Seneca to see this association of Cato and *libertas* in full rhetorical bloom (c.f. *De Const.* 2.2, *neque enim Cato post libertatem vixit nec libertas post Catonem*; for further examples see also *Ep.* 13.14, 24.6, 95.71). Lintott (1971: 488) writes that in Lucan's epic, the poetic unity centers upon "the suicide of the old Rome, with *libertas* its single and vital surviving legacy." Cf. Lebek (1976: 62): "In diesem Textzusammenhang kann die Abschlußsentenz 1,128 natürlich nicht Pompeius ins Recht setzen." Ahl (1976: 304) writes that the *victa causa* was the "republican cause" which didn't want necessarily to bring back the Republic literally but grant to the senatorial class more autonomy under a reformed Principate. On the ideal of libertas during the later Julio-Claudians, see Wirszubski (1950) and Fantham (1999).

Caesar's victory at Pharsalus when the intruding narrator announces that Pompey's departure transformed the conflict into one between "the matched opponents we always have, Liberty and Caesar" (*sed par quod semper habemus | libertas et Caesar*, 7.695-6), and in Book 9 when Lucan's narrator again declares that after Pompey's funeral commemoration, the cause was solely that of *libertas* (*totae post Magni funeral partes | libertatis erant*, 9.29-30).[6]

If the *victa causa* is the ideal of *libertas*, the *victrix causa* opposing it is itself not so much the historical victory of Caesar but the very *idea* of *Caesar* (cf. 7.695-6 quoted above).[7] The gods are made the *magnus iudex* on the victorious side since they by definition justify the *victores* through *fatum* or divine will.[8] The depiction of a pair of judges ideologically opposed to each other, however, points to a matter of crucial importance for reading Lucan's Cato and indeed the thrust of the entire epic. It implicitly declares that there is *still* a contest that is *ongoing* between the cause that won and the cause that lost, that some other conflict beyond that of the immediate, historical civil war itself is still being waged. Commenting on 7.695-6, Lucan's redefinition of the conflict from a military struggle to an ideological one, David Quint writes:

---

[6] This identification of the *victa causa* can help clear up what otherwise would seem a contradiction with the statement in 1.127 that it is *nefas* to decide whether Pompey or Caesar took up arms more justly. If the two *causae* only refer to the warring camps of Caesar and Pompey respectively, then Cato as a proponent of the *victa causa* would seem guilty of participating in that same *nefas* (likewise the gods). On this point, cf. Master (1992: 9). If, however, Lucan is fashioning Cato as the advocate of the ideal of *libertas* and not of a political faction at all, then Cato does not have to embrace the *nefas* of waging civil war (*induit arma*) but can instead stand as a morally justified opponent in the ongoing war on behalf of *libertas*.

[7] On this point see Lintott (1971: 503), Ahl (1976: 56), Johnson (1987: 32), Quint (1993: 148), Narducci (2002: 324). I will revisit this topic of the ongoing struggle between *libertas et Caesar* in fuller detail in Chapter 7 when I discuss the reappearance of Cato in Book 9.

[8] Ahl (1976: 244–5, 304–5) concludes that this text serves primarily to distinguish Cato's motives from the passive, uncaring gods and to portray him as a champion of the morally right; Narducci (2002: 387) writes that 1.128 represents for Cato "la titanica ribellione di un saggio il quale, fattosi ormai pari agli dèi, non ha più bisogno del loro consiglio per effettuare le sue scelte fondamentali."

> Precisely at the moment of crushing republican defeat, the poem announces a sequel of ongoing resistance: this is the war we are still fighting, despite setbacks. Such assertions at the beginning and ending of the narration of Pharsalia counterbalance the despairing declaration of finality that lies between them."[9]

This paradigm places its attention firmly upon the defeated cause, giving it a voice within the epic to resist the dominating imperial voice of *Caesar*.[10]

One thing this voice of resistance offers is the possibility that the root concepts of victory and defeat in the *Bellum Civile* are not absolute but have room to be redefined. Since from the start Cato's role is linked with defeat in opposition to victory, it will be useful to explore the ways in which these concepts are built into the fabric of the epic text. To begin with, the epic genre itself is invested in this duality of winner/loser due to the inherent teleology it creates. Jupiter's promise in the *Aeneid* of *imperium sine fine* (1.279) is perhaps the clearest example among Lucan's Roman predecessors, with the rule of Augustus the logical *telos* of the narrative Vergil sets in motion. As David Quint illustrates, however, epic can also consciously play with its teleological form to create resistance to existing narratives:

> "Epic indicates its allegiance to the winning side through the shape of its own narrative. The victors' achievement is restaged by a narrative that steadily advances to reach the ending toward which it has been directed from the beginning. Just as the victors' ideology ascribes principles of confusion and disorder to the enemy so that victory over them may be described as a triumph of reason and meaning, the epic narrative projects episodes of suspension and indirection in order that it may overcome them

---

[9] Quint 1993, 150-1. He goes on to add, "The political hope-against-hope of the Pharsalia lies in this insistence upon historical open-endedness at a time when the hated imperial regime had long been confirmed in power." and "The struggle between Liberty and Caesar goes on and on, and the epic projects no goal or teleology for its narrative: moreover, it warns against the very desire for such endings, which imperial narratives of history are only too willing to provide. To the epic loser endings always seem premature…" (151).

[10] That voice of resistance will be articulated in Cato's speech in Book 2 and brought to full realization in Book 9 when Cato returns; for the arguments articulating these claims, see Chapters 6 and 7 in this study respectively.

> and demonstrate its ultimately teleological form. When these episodes expand or multiply to disrupt narrative unity and closure, epic may be suspected of going over to the side and perspective of the losers, as it does in the anti-Virgilian poems of Lucan and his successors. For if the teleological epic narrative is directed to answering the question 'Who has won,' the absence of an organizing teleology proposes the answer 'Nobody wins,' which be seen as a deep truth (or cliché) about the absurdity of war and history. The losers console themselves that in the long run empire is a no-win affair and that its conquests are bound to perish, and even the staunchly imperialist epic may concede this possibility. But it is precisely empire's long run through history that informs epic's sense of narrative coherence and completion."[11]

Here Quint correctly puts his finger on Lucan's ability to manipulate the concept of victory, but as Roche points out in responding to Quint, epic has always possessed the ability to problematize the outright categories of winner/loser:

> "Even in the passage quoted above, he [Quint] seems to acknowledge the potential of an individual epic poem to deconstruct the binary opposites, 'winner' and 'loser', with which he frames his approach to epic narrative. However, I would suggest that his argument does not acknowledge the extent to which epic poetry realises this potential: these terms are so corroded in classical epic as to be virtually useless as meaningful concepts. For who can be said to have 'won' the *Iliad*, or the *Aeneid*, or [Lucan's] *De Bello Civili*? What is it that has been won in each case and what price? In what useful sense can these plots be seen as promoting a winner at all? The nexus of defeat in victory articulated since the dawn of epic narrative as we have it is so ingrained that to suggest that the fundamental question of epic narrative is 'who has won?' effectively elides the central point of books such as Iliad 24, Aeneid 12, De Bello Civili 7, Thebaid 11, or Punica 10. Much more pertinent a question, if we allow ourselves to be drawn into distilling epic narrative into these terms, would be 'is victory possible?' or 'how did we come to exist under certain ideological conditions?'"[12]

In what follows I will demonstrate the deep extent to which Lucan exploits this latent characteristic of epic to show how much this tendency towards universal defeat becomes a programmatic quality of civil war that threatens to overwhelm all facets of the epic—

---

[11] Quint (1993: 46).

[12] Roche (2005: 56-7).

including even Cato and his stated goals of commemorating the lost *libertas* of old Rome.and becoming a beneficial self-sacrifice. An analysis of Book 1 will provide an ample case study for exploring this universal collapse into the status of being defeated. To this end I will first examine Lucan's proem for programmatic evidence followed by an analysis of each appearance of the term *vincere* ("to conquer") in Book 1 in its various active and passive forms and derivatives.

The Subversion of Victory (1.1–7)

Until recent years, Lucan scholarship has made little actual effort to *interpret* the contents of the epic's opening lines. Instead, the debate focused almost exclusively on the authenticity and authorship of the first seven lines, a debate spurred by the ancient autobiographical tradition that Lucan did not write them.[13] While most scholars in the first half of the 20th century accepted this tradition,[14] the validity of this position began to be questioned more and more beginning in 1951 with an article by Enrica Malcovati that defended Lucan's authorship of the prologue.[15] Conte in 1966 also challenged the traditional view as mere guesswork typical of the bibliographic traditions found in the scholiasts, and since this time scholars have largely followed his lead in concluding that

[13] The Vossianus biography of Lucan and the *Commenta Bernensia* hand down the tradition that this prologue was in fact written not by Lucan but by a close acquaintance or relative such as Seneca and was appended to the front of the epic since Lucan's original opening verse (v.8) seemed to begin too abruptly, as the *Commenta Bernensia* explains: *ne videretur liber ex abrupto incohare*.

[14] Cf. Herrmann (1947), Levi (1949), and Griset (1954). For a bibliography of earlier studies, see Levi (1949: 71n1). Taking a different tack, Nock (1926) looked instead to the possible links between Lucan's lament over the yet-unconquered peoples of 1.18–20 and Nero's contemporary military ambitions.

[15] Malcovati (1951); a decade later Wuilleumier and Le Bonniec (1962) also rejected the tradition in their commentary on Book 1.

Lucan was in fact the author of the first seven lines.[16] Conte then moved beyond matters of the textual tradition toward a discussion of the actual *contents* of the proem. More recent studies have recognized that the prologue's comparison of civil war to an act of suicide is a central image to our understanding of the poem, and yet it remains that the opening lines of Lucan's epic have not been studied by the majority of current scholarship as deeply as they deserve.[17]

The first seven lines do far more than just establish the subject of the epic as the Roman civil war between Pompey and Caesar. Like in other works in the epic tradition, they have a programmatic function in guiding our reading of the rest of the epic, a reading that will ultimately impact Lucan's Cato.

Part 1 Bella per Emathios plus quam civilia campos
(1) iusque datum sceleri canimus, (2) populumque potentem
in sua victrici conversum viscera dextra
(3) cognatasque acies,
Part 2 (4) et rupto foedere regni
certatum totis concussi viribus orbis
in commune nefas, (5) infestisque obvia signis
signa, (6) pares aquilas et pila minantia pilis. (1.1–7)

(Wars worse than civil waged across Emathian plains we sing: (1) law given over to crime, and (2) a powerful people turned against their own guts by means of their victorious right hand, and (3) the slaughter of kin against kin, | and (4) after the rulers' agreement had been broken, they fought each other with all the forces of a shattered world, all devolving into commonly-shared *nefas*, and (5) against hostile war banners faced war banners, and (6) matched eagle-standards and threatening spears set against spears.)

---

[16] Conte (1966); the trend toward accepting Lucan's authorship has progressed far enough that Paratore (1992) in his chapter on the proem no longer felt the need to defend his analysis of the opening lines as meaningful to an interpretation of the poem.

[17] On suicide as a central organizing theme for civil war, see Ahl (1976: 320), Masters (1992: 29), Quint (1993: 141), Bartsch (1997: 24), Leigh (1997: 218), Hill (2004: 213). One of the other fruitful areas of research has been the ongoing investigations into the many Vergilian echoes to be found in the proem, e.g. Narducci (1985) and Paratore (1992).

Lucan begins by stating his subject in the first line: "wars more than civil." The qualifier "*plusquam*" points to the unique nature of *this* civil war, for it was no ordinary civil war but held in its grasp the very identity of Rome, the greatest power in the known world.[18] The next three lines are technically a continuation of Lucan's statement of subject, but rhetorically they form three discrete characterizations of the subject that exemplify the true nature of this civil war about to be narrated. Lucan creates three contrasting pairs that should not go together yet do because of civil war, and the result in each is subversive. He first pairs *ius* and *scelus* to characterize civil war as *iusque datum sceleri* ("law given over to crime"). In the second we find a symbol of victory in the *victrici dextra* directed *in sua viscera* ("a powerful people, turned against their own guts by means of their victorious right hand"). The third description is the *cognatasque acies* ("the slaughter of kin against kin").[19]

The first contrast states that the waging of this civil war subverted both the law and more generally the moral order—the enaction of *nefas*.[20] The second defines the civil war in terms of the suicide of Rome and her body politic, which is the subversion of both the proper target of warfare and its proper purpose, namely the survival of one's own people. Finally, the third reveals the subversion of the family order, that basic unit of social and political stability in Roman society, when brother slays brother. What

---

[18] Leigh (1997: 74n72) comments that the focus on Emathian plains (*per Emathios campos*) "locates Pharsalus as the moral centre of the poem and urges that the theme of the *Pharsalia* is something worse than conventional civil wars."

[19] Together the statement of subject and these three descriptions of civil war comprise precisely the first half of the prologue, ending with the primary caesura of line 4. For this reason, along with the fact that they all state subversions of the natural order, I believe that these three characterizations may properly be read as a single rhetorical unit.

[20] Cf. Hill (2004: 214) on the corruption of ethical norms in the proem, which sets the tone for the rest of the epic.

results from these subversions of the natural order is of critical importance. *This* civil war is overtly subversive, and its pernicious effect on Roman society will be reflected in the poetics of the epic itself.[21]

A comparison with previous epic will highlight the singular catastrophe of waging civil war. From a purely military/strategic point of view, the criterion for becoming *victor* is the achieving of one's goals at the expense of the opponent who is defeated. This process typically climaxes in a scene of pitched battle pitting two warriors against each other, and it is resolved when one of them becomes the last man standing upon the field of battle. Thus we find Achilles boasting of his victory over the defeated Hector, and Aeneas literally standing over the defeated Turnus. It is true that simple divisions into winner and loser are more problematic, as discussed above by Roche, but at least Achilles and Aeneas have external enemies to gain victory over. The conventional rewards for the epic *victor* include such boons as κλέος in the eyes of others, military and/or political power, and in particular the *spolia* taken from the defeated enemy. This last component serves as one of the chief visible symbols of the victor's κλέος. The defeated person in contrast receives the opposite: if they don't receive outright death, they will at least suffer a loss of power along with the humiliating loss of all personal *gloria* as it is transferred to the *victor*. In a specifically Roman setting, where "*virtus* was demonstrated in the process of winning personal g*loria* by committing great deeds in the service of the Roman state," a key reward for the victorious army commander was the

[21] For the classic treatments of Lucan's internalization of civil war's destructiveness into the language of the epic text, see Masters (1992) and Henderson (1998).

chance to lead a triumphal procession before the eyes of the assembled Roman people.[22] Lucan's epic, however, offers these rewards to nobody, for they are not available when the enemy is yourself.

The key place to see this at work is in the second of Lucan's characterizations in which civil war is depicted as the functional equivalent of a national suicide (*populumque potentem in sua victrici conversum viscera dextra* 1.2–3). Scholars are correct in identifying this image as central to the epic, but they have by and large overlooked the importance of the context of would-be victory within which this suicide image is placed. What specifically causes the suicide to take place is the *victorious* right hand, expressed as an instrumental ablative. Yet the crucial point here is not merely that engaging in civil war is tantamount to suicide, but precisely that *the very act of winning the victory results in the suicide*! The would-be *victor*, by means of the very act that would seem to cause victory, instead causes his own defeat.[23] This marks a profound subversion of the concept of victory within the epic landscape, for it shows that in Lucan the civil war inherently seeks to subsume all actions into the realm of self-defeat. In Lucan's world of civil war, suicide—a self-defeat—rather than glory or triumphs becomes the direct, natural result of victory.[24]

---

[22] Gorman (2000: 264).

[23] This is a perfect example of Lucan's tendency to deconstruct meaning, but as discussed in Chapter 1 I cannot agree with the many scholars who find that this tendency necessarily frustrates meaning in the text. Instead, I argue that the deconstruction of one meaning leads to the *creation* of another. The process here in Lucan should perhaps best described as positively transformative.

[24] It is likely that Lucan is interacting here with Ovid's *Fasti* 1.335 where Ovid gives an etymology of the sacrificial "*victima*" as deriving from the "victorious right hand" that is responsible for the killing the sacrificial animal (*victima quae dextra cecidit victrice vocatur*). There thus exists an established etymology that connects *victima* (sacrifice) with *dextra victrix*, which gives extra poignancy to Lucan's opening image as a picture of ritual *self*-sacrifice.

Lucan reinforces these very issues in the second half of the prologue, maintaining them with an emotional *amplificatio* that continues Lucan's characterizations of civil war.[25] Its opening statement (*et rupto foedere regni certatum totis concussi viribus orbis in commune nefas*) signals another programmatic function of the prologue upon which Lucan has built his epic, namely that the single outcome toward which civil war drives is *nefas in commune*. This is the spolia available to those who participate in such a self-destructive conflict. Such an image builds upon the central image of suicide in the first half of the prologue, and here in the second half Lucan drives that point home. The closing lines of the prologue (*infestisque obvia signis signa, pares aquilas et pila minantia pilis*) are themselves a pictorial commentary on the idea of *commune nefas*, revealing a glimpse of what this *nefas* will look like in more concrete terms. In conclusion, Lucan's prologue states that there is no glory or victory—indeed, by definition *cannot* be—for the "victorious" epic hero in civil war. Ironically, winning is the very act that causes defeat.

Lucan's poetics thus transform the ostensible (and historically real) victory of Caesar into a resounding defeat. While many of Lucan's epic predecessors also explored "the nexus of defeat in victory" (to use Roche's phrase cited above), the extent to which Lucan makes the impossibility of victory in any regular sense of the word the very fabric from which this epic world operates is revolutionary. At the heart of the prologue's programmatic message lies this defeat of victory. When Lucan's epic is studied under this interpretive lens, it sheds new light upon many aspects of the poem. If, for example, Caesar truly defeats himself by means of his military victory through civil war, then it is

[25] On this rhetorical device here in the prologue, see Conte (1966: 17).

no longer the case, as Ahl has argued, that Lucan can find recourse *only* in the moral vilification of Caesar and exaltation of Cato.[26] Instead, by redefining the way in which his epic universe functions, the poet can depict Caesar as an historical winner who is simultaneously a loser who defeats himself personally and all of Rome corporately by means of his "victorious" right hand.

The *Spolia* of Civil War (1.8–66)

The rest of the proem continues to build upon the foundations of these ideas laid in the prologue.[27] In line 8, the bridge between the prologue and the next section of the proem, the poet literally shouts out to the reader, *Quis furor, O cives, quae tanta licentia ferri?* ("What madness, O citizens, what excessive freedom of the sword?") This launches the poet's complaint against the *furor*/*nefas* expressed in the first seven lines, the madness of civil war that subverts the natural order and turns a nation against itself. Lucan expands this complaint in the following four lines which provide a concrete example of this *furor*:

> gentibus invisis Latium praebere cruorem
> cumque superba foret Babylon spolianda tropaeis
> Ausoniis umbraque erraret Crassus inulta
> bella geri placuit nullos habitura triumphos? (1.9–12)

> (Did it please you to offer Latin bloodshed to the hostile nations, even while proud Babylon still needed to be conquered and stripped clean of Roman victory trophies? Did it please you, even while Crassus's ghost

[26] This is the view of Ahl (1976: 68): "The writer who wishes to damn the winner and glorify the loser has to take refuge in issues of morality. The only way a losing cause can be represented as better than a victorious one is in terms of right and wrong on a moral scale. The winner must be stripped of moral justification, and the loser must be shown as virtuous." According to my argument, this is only part of Lucan's larger poetic plan, for we find that not only was Caesar was less than virtuous but also that he was in truth doomed to defeat through his own victory.

[27] As set forth in this section, the continuity of thought between 1-7 and 8-32 is so strong that in my view the burden of proof lies upon the critic who would argue *against* a Lucanian authorship of the first seven lines.

> wandered about unavenged, to wage the kinds of wars that have no triumphs?)

Here the speaker laments in horror the terrible irony of Romans attacking each other when so many other nations still remained to be conquered, when even the grisly disaster at Carrhae (53 BC) at the hands of the Parthians was still unavenged.

Underneath this lament Lucan contrasts two types of warfare: the standard image aimed properly against foreign enemies and the new paradigm of civil war that leads to self-destruction. In a conventional war, Rome fights against foreign enemies to subdue them, whereas in a civil war, Roma becomes her own enemy and must absurdly wage war against herself. This contrast accentuates that one of the crucial differences in this subversive war Lucan is narrating is the subversive nature of the *spolia* it has to offer. A conventional war can provide the *victor* with *tropaea*, whereas Lucan is explicit that a civil war cannot: *bella habitura nullos triumphos*. As the *tropaeum* is the most visible symbol of military victory, Lucan is thus announcing that in this civil war, victory—as it is traditionally thought of—cannot exist.[28] This further reinforces the prologue's argument that the only reward a civil war can provide is self-destructive *commune nefas*.

The sections following the opening lines of the proem (1.8-66) in fact describe three concrete manifestations of this *nefas* as the *spolia* that can be won from a civil war.[29] The first reward to be gained (1.8–23) is the above-mentioned *impossibility* of any triumphs. When Lucan laments, *Heu, quantum terrae potuit pelagique parari hoc quem*

---

[28] Indeed, one consistent aspect of Lucan's epic is its denial of traditional epic κλέος to the would-be victor; cf. Gorman (2001: 264ff).

[29] Lines 1.8-32 form an apostrophe to the *cives Romani*, and 1.33-66 forms the famous apostrophe of adoration to Nero; I read these together as exhibiting three logical outcomes of civil war (two in the first apostrophe and the third as the advent of Nero himself). On the numerous allusions to such poetic predecessors as Horace and Vergil contained in this first apostrophe (1.8-32), see Hershkowitz (1998: 198-200); cf. Roche (2005: 57).

civiles hauserunt sanguine dextrae ("Alas, how much land and sea could have been obtained with this blood which our citizens' hands drank up!" 1.13–14), his focus is laid clearly on the sense of loss and lost opportunity that the civil war created. Lucan also emphasizes its self-destructive quality: *Roma…in te verte manus* ("Roma, turn your hand against yourself" 1.21–23). The use of this hand imagery along with *civilis dextra* in 1.14 picks up on the central suicide image from the prologue and underscores the critical message that even victory in a war aimed against oneself can yield none of the conventional rewards, only defeat. In these lines, what should have been an opportunity for Romans to display genuine *virtus* and thus achieve *gloria* was thrown away by the choice to turn their sword hands against each other—the enactment of *commune nefas*.

The next reward (1.24–32) to be gained from civil war is also contrary to standard expectation: *at nunc semirutis pendent quod moenia tectis urbibus Italiae lapsisque ingentia muris saxa iacent nulloque domus custode tenentur*… ("But now, Italy's walls sag down with their roofs half-ruined, and where the structures have collapsed huge blocks of stone lie strewn about, and the dwellings are held by nobody to guard them…" 1.24–26) The second *spolium* of civil war thus becomes the devastation and ruin of Italy. In this vision, very few people are left (*rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat* 1.27) and the fields have long been left barren (*multosque inarata per annos Hesperia* 1.28–29). To help drive home this image, Lucan again employs hand imagery twice in this passage as part of a study in contrasts. He first mentions the needy fields that lack hands to work them (*desuntque manus poscentibus arvis* 1.29), notable for its suggestion of what would have been the proper use of a citizen's hands. Lucan sets in opposition to this the closing words of the section, *alta sedent civilis vulnera dextrae* ("deep are the

wounds from citizens' hands" 1.32) which describe the self-destructive uses to which they have been put thus far. Instead of using their hands to help things grow, the *populus Romae* have helped destroy the state.

Interestingly, Lucan opens this section with *at nunc*, rendering this passage in essence a poetic commentary on his own contemporary setting in the 60's AD.[30] As the reign of Nero was historically one of relative peace and prosperity for the Roman peninsula, Lucan cannot here be making a factual statement about the current state of the Italian countryside. The passage makes some emphasis on the past and the passage of time (*antiquis urbibus…multosque inarata per annos*), all of which points to a time when things were not in decay. As the past downfall of the Republic through civil war forms the central axis of this epic, Lucan is making a symbolic statement about the current state of Rome in his own day as compared to the long-past days before the Caesars when *libertas* was still upheld. With *libertas* lost, all we see are the tangled, crumbled landscape of the old Republic—the ruins of which still remain, however, to serve as a reminder of things past. And yet, that memory is threatened by a loss of identity, for while the landscape is full of past remains it is now functionally *sine nomine*.[31] These ruins need a speaker to identify them and revive this memory of things long past and perished so that they can have meaning once more. Unfortunately, with only a *rarus*

[30] Cf. Roche (2005: 58) who writes that the use of *nunc* implicates Lucan's audience "in the subject matter of the epic, since its terminal point will be *nunc* ('now', 1.24): contemporary, imperial, Neronian Italy." He also notes the inverted parallel here with the *Aeneid* when Anchises predicts the future growth and prosperity of the Roman people throughout the landscape (*Aen*. 6.771-6), which now in Lucan is portrayed as having regressed full circle back to its epic starting point due to civil war.

[31] Roche (2005: 58) notes how Lucan's description parodies *Aen*. 6.776: *haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae*. For Lucan, looking backward rather than forward, the same can still be said simply by replacing *erunt* with *erant*.

habitator (1.27) remaining, the memory of this past is in real danger of being swallowed up whole and cast into the *oblivio* of universal defeat.

Following the rhetorical organization of the proem, the third and final *spolium* of civil war thus becomes Nero himself (1.33–66). Suddenly transitioning from laments to the great wonders of Nero, the poet cries out, *Quod si non aliam venturo fata Neroni invenere viam…scelera ipsa nefasque hac mercede placent* ("But even if the Fates had found no other way for Nero to come…the very crimes and unspeakable evils are worth this reward" 1.33–38). Whether Lucan meant this sudden and extreme praise to be sincere or not continues to be one of the most debated and contentious parts of the entire epic.[32] The answer to this question will also determine whether the "gift" of Nero in Lucan's own time should be seen as a positive *spolium* or not. It is possible, as the ancient lives suggest, that the praise was initially a sincere (if excessive by modern standards) dedication to Lucan's imperial patron before their falling out. I see two factors, however, that lend support to the opinion that Lucan's fulsome praise is meant ironically. Since the first two *spolia* are clearly negative, undesirable consequences of civil war, it would be rhetorically consistent for the third also to be at its root a subversive reward.[33] Furthermore, I find it hard to square away the negative context of "*at nunc*" at 1.24 with its image of a desolate Italy and a subsequently sincere appreciation for what "*nunc*" looks like under Nero. Ultimately, this debate doesn't change the overall picture that Lucan is systematically undermining all the standard means (and meanings) of victory in the *Bellum Civile*.

---

[32] Cf. Dilke (1972: 75ff), Lebek (1976: 74ff), Dewar (1994), Rudich (1997: 113-6), Narducci (2002: 22-6), Radicke (2004: 162).

[33] On this point I agree with Flume (1950: 298) who saw in Nero, "sein Erscheinen ist das Endergebnis—*nicht* die Überwindung—von *scelera nefasque* I 37."

The Vocabulary of *Victor* / *Victus* in Book 1: A Case Study

Lucan continues to reinforce this transformation of victory into defeat throughout the whole epic. By way of illustration, I will survey Lucan's careful use of the verb *vincere* and its various derivations over the course of Book 1 in order to demonstrate the extent to which the poet consistently blurs the distinctions between the active victor and the passive defeated party. A pattern emerges in which the outcome of victory is rhetorically linked textually with the category of "defeat" rather than with any traditional or "triumphal" outcome.

After the proem, Lucan next uses *vincere* in his discussion of the causes that led to the outbreak of civil war. It is notable that two of the three causes are stated in terms of who had to be *defeated* before such a war could be possible. Crassus's death is mentioned first (1.104–8), during which Lucan pauses to address the Parthians: "You gave civil war to the defeated people!" (*bellum victis civile dedistis*, 1.108) Although referring in its immediate context to the soldiers under Crassus, *victis* also stands for all the recipients of this Parthian "gift," namely the entire Roman people. Although its surface meaning is clear, in phrasing it as he does, Lucan identifies the Roman people with the status of a defeated people even before the fighting begins. This in turn suggests a further conclusion: those who engage in civil war are collectively defeated (*victi*) already.

After Julia's death (1.111–120), the final prerequisite for war is Caesar's defeat of the Gauls and the jealousy it inspired in his rival Pompey (1.120–8). This mention of the Roman victory in Gaul seems to balance out Crassus's earlier defeat, restoring to the

Romans their familiar status as *victores* over their enemies. The rhetorical construction of Lucan's poetry here, however, hints otherwise:

> *Tu, nova ne veteres obscurent acta triumphos*
> *Et victis cedat piratica laurea Gallis,*
> *Magne, times.* (1.121–123)

> You, Magnus, fear that *his* recent deeds will obscure your past triumphs, that your victories over pirates will yield to *his* conquered Gauls.

Every victory must by definition create a losing side, so the poet's mention of the Gauls defeated by Caesar seems at first glance straightforward. The construction of the passage, however, focuses on the defeated party (*victis Gallis*) rather than on any positive image of triumph. Lucan succeeds in creating a subtle rhetorical effect whereby the victory is described in terms of a defeat. This connection between victory and defeat is not overt as in the proem, but it does achieve a simple shift in focus: the text fails to emphasize a victory at all.

By itself this is perhaps unremarkable, but the pattern becomes much more evident when we consider Pompey. In a sharp contrast to Caesar, Lucan openly grants Pompey numerous victories embodied in his cherished *veteres triumphos et laurea*. The general, however, is afraid that the glory of his own victories will be surpassed by the greatness of Caesar's victory in Gaul. The rhetoric of the passage suggests something greater still—taken literally, Pompey is afraid that his victories will give way (*cedat*) to a defeated people. In other words, he fears that the *victi Galli* will overcome—*defeat*—his *victoria*. Lucan's rhetoric hints that the great paradox in the waging of this civil warfare is the sinister power of defeat over victory.

The next instance of *vincere*, the famous *sententia* in which Cato is first introduced (1.128), has already been discussed. Of the remaining twelve passages in

Book 1 in which *vincere* appears, the next ten all deal with Caesar, characterizing either his person or his activities and their consequences. In the first use, the poet declares that the only thing Caesar is ashamed of is when he conquers without resorting to war (*solusque pudor non vincere bello*, 1.145*)*. While on the surface the phrase merely creates an image of Caesar as a violent warmonger (*acer et indomitus*, 1.146), there is more at play here. It goes a long way in defining Caesar within this epic: he is a conqueror who will continue to conquer. This activity, however, takes on a sinister tone when placed in the context of the passage as a whole. A few lines later, Caesar's famous comparison to a lightning bolt is introduced by a revealing assessment of Caesar's preferred method of victory, for he "rejoices to have created his path through ruin" (*gaudensque viam fecisse ruina*, 1.150). This subtly clarifies the method by which this *victor* achieves his goal, namely through ruin (*ruina*). While it is normal for the losing side to suffer ruin, Lucan chose again to associate Caesar's victory at a rhetorical level with ruin, the bounty of the defeated. Furthermore, in a civil war where the battleground is one's own country, the victor will be someone who brings *ruina* upon himself.

Lucan reinforces Caesar's characterization as *victor* by next having Caesar describe himself that way during his address to *Roma* at the banks of the Rubicon: "Behold, I have arrived, Caesar the victor on land and sea, everywhere your soldier (if once, may I be so now too)" (*en, adsum victor terraque marique Caesar, ubique tuus (liceat modo, nunc quoque) miles*, 1.201–2). Caesar defines himself as a *victor*, and it is natural to think of his conquests in Gaul to explain the term. Yet Caesar's own description of his victory does not limit itself to a specific region but encompasses rather the entire world—on land and sea everywhere (*terraque marique…ubique*). In essence,

he is describing himself as a *victor* who conquers everything, implicitly suggesting that he will be *victor* over *Roma* as well. The irony is that Caesar frames himself as *Roma's* ally, even calling himself "your soldier" (*tuus miles*). Caesar claims to be fighting on behalf of the very thing he is about to fight against, once again presenting a picture of self-defeat in civil war. Caesar fails to recognize that the spoils of victory in a civil war are the opposite of those gained in a more traditional conflict.

Lucan uses the next two appearances of *vincere* to reflect on the *spolia* that Caesar's victory would in fact bring. After the invaders have crossed the Rubicon, Curio, a tribune of the *plebs*, arrives in Caesar's camp to urge them on toward Rome. The Senate, allied more closely with Pompey, had taken the ultimate step of driving the pro-Caesarian tribunes from the city, an act that Lucan correctly identifies as illegal: *expulit ancipiti discordes urbe tribunos victo iure* (1.266–7). Both the wording and the timing here are significant. Lucan notably employs *vincere* to describe the illegal procedure, as if the laws had suffered a military defeat (*victo iure*); he also places the description immediately after the narrative of Caesar's invasion of the border and arrival in Ariminum. Although it was the Senate and not Caesar who expelled the tribunes, the rhetorical construction of the passage suggests that it was a direct outcome of Caesar's crossing the Rubicon, itself an illegal act. Lucan implicitly suggests that the defeat and collapse of law is the first of many "spoils to the victor" in this civil war. For his part, Curio urges Caesar and his troops, now exiled from Rome as enemies (*pellimur e patriis laribus patimurque volentes exilium*, 1.278–9), to keep waging the civil war in order to restore their rights as citizens: *tua nos faciet victoria civis* (1.279). Curio clearly believes that a victory will gain a restoration of rights and laws, but in Lucan's epic world a

military victory will only bring self-destruction, and what the *victor* loses in the process of winning cannot so easily be brought back to life. The *ius victum*, at least insofar as the Senate's authority is concerned, will remain defeated.

Spurred on by Curio, Caesar makes his own appeal to the troops to wage this war, encouraging them with numerous reminders of their past victories during the Gallic campaign.

> *Bellorum o socii, qui mille pericula Martis*
> *mecum, ait, experti decimo iam vincitis anno…* (1.299–300)
>
> *…ultima Pompeio dabitur provincia Caesar,*
> *quod non victrices aquilas deponere iussus*
> *paruerim?* (1.338–340)
>
> *tollite iam pridem victricia, tollite, signa!* (1.347)

> "O comrades of wars," he said, "who have shared with me in a thousand dangers of war, you have already been winning now for ten years…
>
> …shall Caesar be the last province granted to Pompey, just because when bidden he refused to lay down his victorious military standards?
>
> Take up now at long last our victorious banners, take them up!"

Caesar reminds his men that since they have already been in the act of conquering for the past ten years (*decimo iam vincitis anno*), invading Roma will simply be a continuation of that effort; they even have the victorious standards to prove their success in warfare.[34] These uses of *vincere* are less overtly linked with defeat than the others in Book 1, but they still trigger the irony of civil war suggested by the proem. In making these many references to his past victories, Caesar assumes that the coming civil war will be just like

[34] The reference to ten years of fighting creates a natural intertext with Homer's *Iliad*, in which Caesar subtly casts his army as newer versions of the soon-to-be-victorious Greeks. This suggests that Caesar sees his advance as an ordinary waging of war against an enemy. However, Lucan has no intentions of fulfilling these expectations when the attack is against Rome herself, and Caesar's coming "victory" can only ensure self-defeat.

any other military conflict. He is blinded to the grim reality that in a civil war, in which the opponent is one's own people, the *ruina* caused by war forms the chief part of the *spolia*.

The final speech in Caesar's camp is made by Laelius who essentially speaks for the soldiers. Urging Caesar to delay no longer in his conquest of Rome, Laelius poses the crucial question: "Is it really such a horrible thing to win by means of civil war?" (*usque adeo miserum est civili vincere bello?*, 1.366) To the assembled host, the assumed answer would be "no." To Lucan's reader, however, the obvious answer is "yes." From the proem onward, Lucan has consistently shown that the act of conquering in a civil war leads to a result that looks a lot more like defeat than any triumph or success. Interestingly—and perhaps not coincidentally—this is the final instance of *vincere* in the active voice for the remainder of Book 1. Now that Caesar has committed fully to his course of *vincere civili bello*, the presence only of the passive voice of *vincere* hints at the result of such a course. It is as if Lucan answers Laelius's question in showing that when someone pursues active victory through civil war, the only available outcome is the passive outcome of defeat. This is reinforced a few lines later when Laelius remarks how this army set out with Caesar to leave behind itself a defeated world: *ut victum post terga relinqueret orbem* (1.369).[35] This is a standard way of saying that Rome has subdued all her foreign enemies, but once again Lucan's rhetoric describes the outcome of Caesar's great military successes in terms of a defeat. This time, however, it is not merely a single people but the whole world that has suffered defeat. In a Roman civil war, Rome and her people cannot escape being included in this same dire outcome.

[35] Cf. Leigh (1997: 205).

His choice made, Caesar raced down the Italian peninsula towards Rome, sparking a great panic among the city's people, for whom Caesar appears worse than the savage enemies he conquered: *maiorque ferusque mentibus occurit victoque immanior hoste* (1.479–80). Caesar the *victor* becomes to the Roman people practically indistinguishable from the *victus*. Although at one level this passage emphasizes the power of rumor on a fickle populace, its rhetoric links Caesar with a defeated person, collapsing the *victor* and *victus* together. Lucan achieves a similar effect in his subsequent description of Rome as a "city teeming with peoples and conquered nations" (*urbem populis victisque frequentem gentibus*, 1.511–2) as Caesar draws even nearer to the city. In this portrayal, Rome is filled with her own native stock (*populus*) as well as bits of all the other peoples across the known world whom Rome has defeated at some point (*victae gentes*). Lucan's choice, however, to name all the non-natives as *victi* is not accidental. Grammatically, the two groups are distinguishable, but the proximity of *victis* with *populis* suggests that *victis* could apply equally to both groups since everyone is in an equal panic with a savage Caesar ready to swoop down on them all. The native Roman *victores* have been collapsed together with the *victi* such that they are now a virtually indistinguishable mob, all of them destined to become *victi* at the hands of Caesar.

The final use of *vincere* in Book 1 comes near the end when Lucan narrates the desperate attempts to learn what the gods have in store for the people of Rome. They consult the seer Arruns who brings forward a sacrificial ox with the intent of reading its entrails. The animal, however, in a dire sign of things to come, puts up a stiff resistance until the attendants manage to force it to its knees; at last it "offers up its defeated neck to

the sacrificial knife" (*deposito victum praebebat poplite collum*, 1.613).[36] Following the pattern established by the proem, the victorious hand of the sacrificer that overcomes this ox's *victum collum* gains for its efforts a long series of dire portents that point only to imminent doom and disaster for Roma (1.618ff). Time and again Lucan creates subtle rhetorical effects that subvert the traditional meaning of victory and instead connect victory with defeat. This is the sinister power of civil war, a power that works to undermine the Caesar's own victorious campaign against his own nation into one of self-defeat.

Such a subversive program in the epic naturally leads one to ask: if in the *Bellum Civile* defeat has gained the victory over all efforts at being victorious, what hope is there for anybody—particularly Cato—to succeed and emerge with any kind of victory? In the passage quoted earlier, Quint seems to suggest that the best hope for an epic voice of resistance is to collapse both categories into "Nobody wins" as a way of denying teleology and dethroning the victor.[37] And yet, as Roche goes on to show in his response to Quint, the act of denying victory to those involved in civil war is itself a teleology.[38] While this does subvert the triumph of the would-be victor, if this preeminence of defeat is the only teleology available within the epic, then it poses a serious threat to Cato having any chance of real success in achieving his stated goals. Cato means to commemorate a dead *libertas* and to become a beneficial self-sacrifice, but Lucan illustrates with his haunting image of an abandoned and nameless landscape the threat

---

[36] This passage creates a ring composition here at the end of Book 1, as Lucan explicitly recalls from the proem the Ovidian allusion (*Fasti* 1.335) to the *victrix dextra* in the ritual sacrifice.

[37] Quint (1993: 46).

[38] Roche (2005: 57).

that such universal defeat poses to the survival and validity of memory. It is this inherent program of self-defeat promised to all who participate in civil war that Lucan's Cato must attempt to overcome. As we shall see, his weapon will be the power of memory.

CHAPTER 3
FEAR AND FORGETTING IN ROME (1.469-2.233)

Cato as Contrast

Cato enters the epic stage at 2.238 when M. Iunius Brutus, the future tyrannicide, seeks out his kinsman Cato in the dead of night to ask whether he will enter the fighting or—in his view—retain his all-important *virtus* by staying free from the damning taint of civil war. One common shortcoming in Lucan scholarship on Cato is the practice of starting with this ensuing pair of speeches without paying much if any regard to the preceding context.[1] Yet the opening words attached to Brutus' actions here read "But not…" (*at non*…, 2.234), a fact that invites us to read the subsequent speeches of Brutus and Cato specifically as a counter-point to what comes before. Both this chapter and the one following will turn our attention to these preceding narratives in order to understand better the ways in which Brutus and Cato will stand as a contrast to what comes before. The nature of this contrast will in turn help illuminate the unique role Lucan is shaping for Cato as a preserver of memory in his epic.

Pietas and the Crisis of Memory

Caesar, following his fateful crossing of the Rubicon (1.204-27), leads his legions to nearby Ariminum, the first city to fall in the civil war (1.228-61). The expelled tribunes seek out Caesar's camp and Curio delivers a fiery speech urging Caesar to hesitate no longer (1.273-91), which prompts Caesar in turn to address his soldiers in a

[1] E.g. Brisset (1964: 148-57), Johnson (1987: 35-42), Bartsch (1997: 73-5), Rudich (1997: 118-22), Sklenář (2003; 59-79), Wildberger (2005: 61-76), Stover (2008: 573-7). Both Ahl (1976: 232-4) and Narducci (2002: 370) acknowledge that the appearance of Cato is thematically connected with what comes before, but neither of them do much to explicate these connections. Radicke (2004: 200) is one of the few who unites the pair of speeches and the preceding narrative into a single unit of Book 2 he calls "Die Reaktion in Rom (16-391)." I go one step further and define the "Reaction in Rome" as everything from 1.469-2.391.

self-justifying speech (1.299-351) that denounces Pompey and promises victory to those who follow him in his declared mission to "free Rome from the masters she is ready to serve" (*detrahimus dominos urbi seruire paratae*, 1.351). And yet, immediately after the speech we read that the crowd of soldiers still hesitates one more time in the face of what they must do to wage civil war:

> dixerat, at dubium non claro murmure volgus
> secum incerta fremit. pietas patriique penates
> quamquam caede feras mentes animosque tumentes
> frangunt; sed diro ferri reuocantur amore
> ductorisque metu. (1.352-6)

> Thus he spoke, but the dubious crowd stews uncertainly, murmuring in hushed tones with each other. *Pietas* and the *penates* of the fatherland break their wills and their spirits, although untamed and swelling with slaughter, but they are called back by their fatal love of the sword as well as by fear of their leader.

What holds them back at this moment are the ties of *pietas* that connect them to their fellow Roman citizens and the *patrii penates* that connect them to their family households and ancestral traditions.[2] Both of these stress the continuity of community among fellow Romans which civil war threatens to shatter. What is more, their hesitation seems to be the result of an act of memory as they recall all the communal ties that help define their place within Roman society and that help underpin the historical continuity of Rome from past to the present and on into the future. It is surprising, however, that this memory of shared communal ties is what is "breaking" (*frangunt*) their spirits, an image which suggests that their years of campaigning with Caesar have rendered these ties no longer an essential part of their identity. What in fact recalls them back to Caesar is their love of warfare (*ferri amore*) and fear of Caesar (*ductorisque metu*), both of

[2] Cf. Ahl (1976: 201). This hesitation is a further example of what Masters (1992: 5) identifies as a systematic effort by Lucan in Book 1 to postpone the start of the civil war.

which seem to have now become their natural environment.[3] This tug-of-war in the soldiers' hearts and minds in fact suggests a kind of memory competition in which the power of fear and a love of warfare for its own sake wins out over *pietas* and *penates*. This prominent position given to fear not only highlights its role as a causal agent in civil war but also illustrates the potential threat such fear poses to *pietas* and the healthy continuity of memory.

For a Roman, *pietas* represented the expected attitude of dutiful devotion shown to the gods, one's *patria*, parents, and finally other kinsmen including children.[4] *Pietas* is thus that quintessential quality that binds one to the larger family unit and ultimately to the communal identity of the Roman state. The classic image of *pietas* (especially so for Roman epic) is that of Aeneas, whom Vergil famously calls *pius Aeneas* repeatedly throughout the *Aeneid*, carrying his father Anchises from the burning rubble of Troy and bringing the household gods to Italy.[5] In connection with the central importance of devotion to parents, Valerius Maximus relates as one of his *exempla pietatis* a legend that tells of a Roman mother who was found guilty of a capital crime and sentenced to die in prison through starvation; her daughter, however, sustained her by offering her mother

---

[3] The *amor ferri* of Caesar's soldiers recalls the *licentia ferri* of 1.8 which in the words of the proem lay at the heart of the madness that led Rome to attack not a foreign enemy but itself.

[4] Cicero provides a definition at *De Invent*. 2.66: *pietatem quae erga patriam aut parentes aut alios sanguine coniunctos officium conservare moneat*. Cf. also in Cicero *De Off*. 2.11, 46; *De Rep*. 6.16. On Cicero's interaction with the ideal of *pietas*, see Emilie (1944) and Wagenvoort (1980: 1-20). Valerius Maximus offers what amounts to a similar definition in his section of *exempla* that illustrate *pietas* (5.4-6), which is entitled *de pietate erga parentes et fratres et patriam*. Cf. also MacDonald (1987: 38), Saller (1996: 105ff). Regarding the *penates*, Hardy (1991: 112) makes explicit the link between the household gods and *pietas*: "The *Penates* were personal gods, but also public gods, presiding over the *pietas* and *virtus* which each individual inherited from his father and contributed to the state." See also Hardy (1991: 28). For a discussion on the vexed question of what the *lares* and *penates* actually represented in Roman religion, see Gradel (2002: 37-8).

[5] Vergil has Aeneas even name himself as such: *sum pius Aeneas* (1.378). For a fine survey of the complex relationship Aeneas has with *pietas* in the *Aeneid*, see Perkell (1999: 35-9).

her own breast as a source of food during visits, to which Valerius concludes that one might think this was an act against nature "if loving our parents was not itself the first law of nature."[6] Silius Italicus summarizes the received tradition of the founding Roman hero succinctly: *tum pius Aeneas terris iactatus et undis |Dardanios Itala posuit tellure penatis* (*Punica* 7.474). This formulation clearly illustrates the *pietas patriique penates* that in this epic ought to hold Caesar's soldiers in check from sacking their own city. And yet they fail, a fact that foreshadows the threat civil war poses throughout Lucan to them and what they mean to Rome. These realms of *pietas—patria, parentes, penates*—comprise the bedrock of traditions that create communal identity by meaningfully connecting the city's past with the present, thus helping to ensure its continuation into the future. As a result, *pietas* goes hand-in-hand with the healthy functioning of memory, both of the individual and of the united community, for one cannot fulfill his obligations to the family or the state if he does not first *remember* his ancestors and his country along with his own relationship to them.[7]

The reason that the concept of *memoria* is of such vital importance in Lucan's epic of national suicide is the fact that to the Roman mind an intimate connection existed between memory and the very concept of life itself.[8] It is in fact this connection that

---

[6] Valerius Maximus 5.4.7: *putarit aliquis hoc contra rerum naturam factum, nisi diligere parentes prima Naturae lex esset*. Valerius relates that this display of *pietas* so impressed the praetor that he had the mother's sentence revoked. Cf. Saller (1996: 106-8).

[7] A useful example from Vergil is Euryalus's request to Ascanius that he take care of his mother should he not return from the scouting mission, a request that is successful when Ascanius is struck by an *imago patriae pietatis* (*Aeneid* 9.294). *Imago* carries a strong association with the function of memory; Lucretius for example comments on the way *imagines* (which he uses interchangeably with *simulacra*) enter the mind which then "grasps" a new idea—or remembers an old one—and thereby creates an intention of the will: *id quod providet, illius rei constat imago* (4.885). Cf. also Cicero's use of *imago* in his discussion of memory at *De Oratore* 2.350ff.

[8] Gowing (2005: 12); he cites a number of passages in Cicero that support this natural connection, particularly with respect to the function of funeral monuments to preserve the life of the deceased through

underlay so much of the imperial Roman anxiety over the conflict of how to remember the pre-Caesarian Republic. To forget a thing is to let it fall into *oblivio*, an essentially valueless nothingness, but to remember a thing is to give it back a certain kind of life, a renewed agency that can continue into the future. This helps us understand why the Romans spent so much time and energy investing in ways that would help ensure that they would be remembered after death.[9] One example can be seen in Cicero's *Ninth Philippic* when Cicero attempts to convince the Senate to pay for a statue and state funeral for his friend Servius Sulpicius Rufus.[10] In his speech, he sums up the essential value of such memorials when he declares:

> *Reddite igitur, patres conscripti, ei vitam, cui ademistis; vita enim mortuorum in memoria est posita vivorum* (*Phil*. 9.10).
>
> So give him back the life you have taken from him, conscript fathers, for the life of the dead is located in the memory of the living.

In a very real sense, the dead can have life given back to them—provided that someone commemorates them. Gowing sums up what was felt to be at stake:

> "But if it was the explicit responsibility of the living to care for the memory of the dead—a responsibility the Romans took with great seriousness—they did so not merely out of honor or respect. In a very real sense the Romans conceived of the dead as continuing to enjoy an existence and even of influencing events in the present."[11]

---

memory. On the whole, Gowing (2005) provides the best current survey of the phenomenon of *memoria* within Roman culture and their anxiety over its preservation. Much of the development of my own analysis on Roman memory is indebted to his work.

[9] As a more lasting physical monument, the tomb was usually the prime focus of time and energy when planning for death in wills; cf. Hope (2000: 106), "The emphasis falls less on the fate of the bones and ashes of the deceased and more upon memory." Pliny at *Ep*. 6.10.3 expresses how disgraceful it is that the tomb of Lucius Verginius Rufus lacked a proper inscription to perpetuate his *nomen*. See also Carroll (2006:18).

[10] On this part of the speech, see Hope (2000: 108).

[11] Gowing (2005: 14).

This desire for a continued vitality and influence—even after death—is the source of the anxiety to remember and be remembered.[12]

As a result, the Romans lived in what Flower has rightly called a veritable "memory culture," employing numerous cultural institutions designed to preserve and perpetuate the memory of the dead.[13] *Exemplum* stories encapsulating certain desired virtues or their lack were one major way of passing on the memory of previous generations of Romans who had performed deeds worthy of remembering. This matrix of stories and values that upheld the *mos maiorum* were passed down into the collective memories of each successive generation. Collective memory was also reinforced by festivals for the dead such as the Parentalia, by commemorative statues, inscriptions, trophies, and spectacles, in addition to the funeral ceremonies themselves and their resulting physical tomb monuments.[14] Implicit in all of these institutions is the notion of an audience that sees the object or hears the story and receives the message that directs them to recall the past people or events which those objects or stories represent; it is this

---

[12] See Carroll (2006: 59ff) for a good discussion of the anxiety felt in Roman culture about the possibility of their memory vanishing into *oblivio*.

[13] Flower (2006: 55).

[14] One need look no further than Livy's style of story-telling or the work of Valerius Maximus to see the hold of the *exemplum* story on the Roman mind; on this see the still useful article by Litchfield (1914), also Chaplin (2000: 5ff). Carroll (2006: 30ff) provides a good overview of the numerous institutions by which the Romans sought to preserve memory of the dead. Post-Augustan Rome in particular was a landscape teeming with monuments that played a part in shaping collective social memory. One prime example is the sculptural program in the Forum Augusti which included statues of the *Summi Viri* of Roman legend installed opposite the famous men of the Julian gens alongside Aeneas and the kings of Alba Longa; cf. Luce (1990), Gowing (2005: 139), Larmour (2007: 181-3). Spectacles, too, were yet another of many institutions that through repetition reinforced the continuity of social values; cf. Flower (2004: 338): "Roman memory was defined in particular ways, and the city itself became a memory space for the recalling of the past and for the assertion of its continuing relevance to the life of the whole community. Spectacles reproduced the social and political order in a way that was essentially didactic for all citizens, but especially for the young." Regarding festivals for the dead, our best source for the Parentalia remains that given by Ovid's *Fasti* 2.537ff. The other three known festivals for the dead were the Feralia and Caristia also held in February and the Lemuria held in May. Cf. Scullard (1981: 74-6, 118-9), Lindsay (1998: 74-6), Dunbabin (2003: 127).

audience that stands as the mediator between the recalled past and whatever will happen to the community as it moves into the future.

Unfortunately for Rome, the passages in Lucan covering the events from Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon up to the appearance of Brutus and Cato (1.469-2.233) are rife with scenes in which fear-driven Romans forget or even abandon outright the communal ties of *pietas* that bind them to Rome. We have already seen above how the *pietas* of Caesar's soldiers is conquered by fear of their leader, but this is matched by a scene set shortly thereafter in Rome when the people react in terror to Caesar's approach and suddenly burst into headlong flight as they leave behind everything in their mad rush to escape the city:

> nullum iam languidus aevo
> evaluit revocare parens coniunxve maritum
> fletibus, aut patrii, dubiae dum vota salutis
> conciperet, tenuere lares; nec limine quisquam
> haesit et extremo tunc forsitan urbis amatae
> plenus abit visu: ruit irrevocabile vulgus. (1.504-9)

> The parent, now weary with age, was not able to call back a single child, nor could one spouse call back the other partner with tears, nor could the ancestral *Lares* retain anyone long enough to make even doubtful prayers for safety; nor did anybody pause at their threshold and then depart filled with perhaps their last sight of the city they loved—the mob rushed out and could not be recalled.

The fleeing mob can be recalled neither by their families (*parens nec coniunx*) nor their native hearth-gods (*Lares*), two of the things that connected a Roman most intimately with the larger networks of people and institutions around him.[15] It is no accidental irony

[15] In this, the mob recalls Caesar's soldiers who likewise remained immune to the pull of their household gods (*penates* in their case). Narducci (2002: 102) notes how this passage here draws much inspiration from Livy's description of the Roman conquest of Alba Longa (1.29) when its defeated population is conducted out of the city. The Albans too abandon their homes and household gods (*cum larem ac penates tectaque in quibus natus quisque educatusque esset relinguentes exirent*), but theirs is a forced abandonment, whereas in Lucan the terrified Romans perversely *choose* to leave.

that the very things that rendered Aeneas most *pius*—saving his aged father and rescuing the hearth-gods from the ruins of Troy—are the very things that are abandoned by the fearful Romans. The abandonment of the *Lares* is destructive, as these sacred objects, like the *penates*, represent a continuity with the past and thus serve as crucial *loci memoriae* for a people. The words of Elisabeth Henry in her study on the *Aeneid* are particularly applicable for our reading of Lucan here: "The *pietas* of personal life however is never separated, in Virgil, from the *pietas* of the leader whose task is to preserve traditions embodied in the objects belonging to a community."[16] In Rome at the eve of civil war we find a fear-led response to the looming threat of defeat that amounts to a glaring rejection of *pietas*, and thus by extension the people's actions result in the abandonment of the memories that help define them as Roman.[17]

The Power of Fear

As we proceed past Caesar's rapid descent upon Rome with his now-decisive army (1.466-8) and analyze the subsequent narrative sections of the epic (1.469-2.233) we continue to see a fear-driven response to civil war and the threats posed by such a response to memory. Amidst the general panic, the people let their imagination run wild as they begin inventing dire scenarios of the future (*vana quoque ad veros accessit fama*

---

[16] Henry (1989: 40). She expounds on this by adding: "For the Romans, the duty of preserving national traditions was of course a religious obligation, and it rested primarily on the older generation. The knowledge of what should be preserved, the right judgment of what should be remembered and forgotten was a most important part of a leader's, or a father's, responsibility. We may think of some of the familiar customs so deeply rooted in Roman life, the preservation of the family *imagines* (death-masks), the memorial statuary, the meticulous rituals, all that is contained in the phrase *mos maiorum*, 'our ancestors' way of life.'"

[17] For a Roman, the act of remembering the past was itself an act of *pietas*. Varro (in a passage summarized by Augustine, *CD* 6.2) saw his *Antiquitates* and its task of remembering history as an act of *pietas* similar to what Aeneas accomplished for *Roma* by establishing for her an identity rooted in her Trojan past. According to Hardy (1991: 29), "Varro wanted to preserve the antiquities and the religious lore of the Romans, and viewed this task as an act of *pietas* equal to (or surpassing) *pius Aeneas*'s rescue of the *Penates* from Troy."

timores, 1.469). Here again it is fear (*timores*) that seems to hold them in its grip. As an extension of this fear they envision that Rome will be sacked by Gauls while Caesar, who ordered the rapine, takes it all in (*iussamque feris a gentibus urbem | Romano spectante rapi*, 1.483-4). Through such images we see that the Roman people acknowledge their coming defeat; this is, after all, what the proem has already promised to everybody in civil war. The series of portents and prophecies of coming doom and defeat that follow (1.522-695) serve to confirm Rome's fated, looming destruction.[18]

Throughout the text of this section Lucan repeatedly highlights fear as a guiding characteristic of the Roman response to their assured defeat. This fear grips the Roman populace, beginning in the *timor* of *clademque futuram* (1.470). The people of Rome are variously described as struck through with terror (*percussum terrore*, 1.487), full of fright (*pavorum*, 1.521), and people who fear Pompey's retreat (*timent*, 1.522) with terrified minds (*trepidas mentes*, 1.523). Driven by their fear (*sic quisque pavendo*, 1.484), the people choose to flee the city *en masse*. Lucan focuses in particular on the flight of the senatorial class. In reacting to Caesar's threatening advance, the city's leaders show themselves just as willing as the rabble to abandon Rome to defeat (*nec solum vulgus…sed curia et ipsi | sedibus exiluere patres*, 1.486-8). Thus we see that one of the first consequences of this fearful response is the effective disappearance of Rome's leadership, a symbol for the self-destruction of the senate's ability to lead the *populus* effectively. Following the image of Rome as a body with constituent parts, such as Menenius Agrippa promoted during the secession of the plebs (Livy 2.32.8ff), what

[18] See for example the opening words of the astrologer Figulus at 1.642-5 with its prediction of *matura lues* being prepared for *urbi generique humano*.

Lucan describes here is a *de facto* decapitation of Rome into another headless corpse.[19] The *patres*, who should be actively preparing defenses or at least presenting a picture of *virtus* and self-control, are instead driven by their fear from the city, each one led wherever the onrush of their flight might randomly take them (*quo quemque fugae tulit impetus urguent | praecipitem populum*, 1.491-2).[20] Lucan's condemnation of this response is reinforced by his use of the simile of a military camp that closes out the section (1.514-20): while the proper response of a Roman soldier to danger is to "flee" behind the security of even a meager camp wall (*effugit exiguo nocturna pericula vallo*, 1.515), the strength of Rome is abandoned at the merest mention of warfare (*tu tantum audito bellorum nomine, Roma, | desereris*, 1.519-20). The frightened, fleeing mob is described as an army (*serieque haerentia longa | agmina prorumpunt*, 1.492-3), but one rendered powerless by its fear-driven response to imminent defeat.

The consequences of this kind of reaction go far beyond mere powerlessness, however. Lucan illustrates this through his powerful simile of sailors rashly reacting to what they imagine to be an impending shipwreck (1.498-504). In the simile, Lucan presents a storm that "drives back immeasurable water from Libyan Syrtes" (*reppulit a*

---

[19] Cf. Dinter (2005: 300-4) who discusses the tradition of the Roman state as a body and Lucan's engagement with this image. See also Bartsch (1997: 15-39) on the prominence of body imagery throughout Lucan; she notes that "…the imagery of boundary violation becomes grimmer and more startling as human bodies are used as the medium for its expression" (15).

[20] Note that the fleeing mob is syntactically controlled by the subject clause *impetus fugae*, as if they have lost all control over their situation, even over their own headlong flight. A similar disappearance of the senatorial leadership occurs early in Book 2 in reaction to the frightening portents of disaster and defeat that closed Book 1, for they attempt to blend in with the crowd (*latuit plebeio tectus amictu | omnis honos, nullos comitata est purpura fasces*, 2.18-19), perhaps under the realization that civil war poses the greatest danger to those of the upper class (a point confirmed by the subsequent flashback to the purges of Marius and Sulla). Fantham (1999: 113) argues that "the poet does not exploit the opportunity to name or blame Senate and magistrates when describing the flight from Rome, but Lucan's description of the *patres* as abandoning the their seats of senatorial authority and fleeing (fugiens, 1.489) after the *volgus* strikes me as a fairly clear condemnation. Fantham does go on to add that the *patres* surrender much of their moral authority, such that "for symbols of legitimacy the reader must look to Cato for guidance."

Libycis immensum Syrtibus aequor, 1.499) which quickly overwhelms a sailing ship, causing the mast to break apart and crash into the waves.[21] The storm, like Caesar's approach, sets up a situation of impending disaster to which the sailors respond by leaping overboard in desperation for their lives. The simile again draws our attention to the desertion of the leadership. The pilot abandons the helm at the moment of decision, despite the fact that—as the poet is careful to note—the ship's hull had not yet failed (*desilit in fluctus deserta puppe magister | navitaque et nondum sparsa compage carinae*, 1.501-2). The simile's closing *sententia* condemns this response as far more destructive than just an act of desertion: *naufragium sibi quisque facit* (1.503). Each sailor, by abandoning ship when the specter of defeat seemed imminent, actually *causes* his own shipwreck. What begins as an attempt to ensure survival ironically becomes an act of self-destruction. While the *victor* must inevitably defeat himself by winning, so too those in danger of becoming defeated can inadvertently ensure this outcome by responding to the imminent possibility of defeat with paralyzing fear and terror.

The Epic Funeral of Rome

Book 2 opens with the inhabitants of Rome acknowledging that the portents and prophecies have confirmed their doom in the coming civil war (*legesque et foedera rerum | praescia monstrifero vertit natura tumultu | indixitque nefas*, 2.2-4), and their fear now gives way to grief (*ferale per urbem | iustitium…tum questus tenuere suos magnusque per omnis | erravit sine voce dolor*, 2.17-8, 20-1).[22] The prophecies

[21] It is interesting that Lucan depicts a sea storm off the shore of North Africa, a setting that not only recalls the storm that afflicts Aeneas in *Aeneid* 1 but also looks ahead to the storm in Book 9 that similarly drives Cato ashore and sets up his march through the Libyan desert.

[22] Lucan throughout keeps his narrative focus upon the people *in* the city, despite the fact that he earlier described the people fleeing out of the city as fast as possible. Within Lucan's hyperbolic style, the earlier description of mass flight reads not as an historical statement but as a poetic device that can evoke a similar

established the inevitability of loss, and now Lucan presents the Romans as mourners who have realized that escape is no longer possible.[23] He accentuates this with a powerful funeral simile (2.21-8) in which a Roman household is shocked into numb silence in the direct aftermath of the death of a loved one (*sic funere primo | attonitae tacuere domus*, 2.21-2).[24] This simile presents a moving snapshot: no cries have yet been uttered, no breasts beaten, no hair yet let down, as the stunned mother touches the fresh corpse. She is silently trapped on the threshold of grief: *necdum est ille dolor nec iam metus: incubat amens | miraturque malum* (2.27-8). Death stares her in the face as it likewise does the Roman people, and we see that the loss of control is complete. The simile sets up an analogy between the grief-stricken people of Rome who are reacting to their imminent defeat and the grief felt by the household—focalized through the mother—who are reacting to a death of one of its own at the very moment it is occurring. In so doing, Lucan neatly illustrates the symbolic connection defeat and death share in the epic. Furthermore, the temporal scope of the simile keeps us from seeing into the future, denying the mother the future time necessary to grieve and remember and rendering the creation of a monumentum for the dead uncertain. Most significantly, however, this simile of a household in shock over a body just past the threshold of death

---

emotional mood of terror in his readers. The people of Rome (however many truly flee the city or not) are *characterized* by flight from their homes and all other institutions that ground them to the *memoria* of their past.

[23] Hence the internal narrator's plea: *liceat sperare timenti* (2.15) The speaker wishes that the future would remain unknown (*caeca*, 2.14) rather than confirm civil war through prophecies, as is the case here, for such a confirmation removes hope, the last refuge of the fearful.

[24] Cf. Ahl (1976: 233-4).

sends a clear signal that Caesar's coming victory must necessarily become the *funus* of Rome herself.[25]

Recognizing that the *Bellum Civile* is at its core an epic whose narrative arc portrays for its readers the death of Rome is crucial to understanding Lucan's epic program. One of the epic's hallmarks is the fact that it is practically littered with elaborated death-sequences along with their accompanying pyres and tombs. To cite but a few representative examples in each book, we can consider the proem's opening image of national suicide (Book 1), the death-bed simile used to describe the atmosphere in Rome at Caesar's approach and the graves filled with refugees from Sulla's purges (Book 2), Massiliote pyres along the shore (Book 3), the theatrical suicides of Vulteius and his men on their rafts (Book 4), the foretold tomb of Appius (Book 5), the bodies that pile up before Scaeva and the grisly graveyard workshop of Erichtho (Book 6), the *funus mundi* of Pharsalus (Book 7), Pompey's humble seaside funeral monument (Book 8), memorial pyres for Pompey and all those who died at Pharsalus as well as the gruesome deaths inflicted on Cato's men by the Libyan snakes (Book 9), and Caesar's visit to the tomb of Alexander the Great (Book 10).

This driving theme culminates at the end of Book 7 in the aftermath of Caesar's victory over Pompey, where we find the battlefield not just piled with corpses but in fact

---

[25] The simile here at the start of Book 2 will be picked up again by Cato himself in his speech when he also uses a funeral simile (2.297-301), but the clear contrast is that while the house here at the beginning of Book 2 is in shock and seemingly unable to act, Cato's mourning father will leap into action to help create a memorial (see Chapter 6 for a full discussion). Salemme (2002: 16) writes that both of these funeral similes "sono immagini, entrambe, di un funerale di ben più ampie proporzioni." This can help illuminate the universalizing dimension of Lucan's poetics. Dinter (2005: 296-300) provides an excellent survey of the "Cosmic Body" that is harmed by the self-destructiveness of civil war. This is perhaps best seen at 1.72-80, culminating in the ringing phrase: *totaque discors | machina divulsi turbabit foedera mundi* (1.79-80). Cf. also 2.16-7, and especially the old man's concluding remarks in the flashback at 2.225-6; also 7.131-2 on the true scope of the impact Pharsalus will have upon the world: *advenisse diem qui fatum rebus in aevum | conderet humanis*.

transformed into a veritable tomb for Rome.[26] We read that Caesar dealt the killing blow to his true targets, *Roma* and *Libertas* (7.580), at which point the internal narrator intrudes to tell the audience that afterwards the victorious Caesar stalks not merely amidst slaughtered soldiers but through the very guts of Rome herself (*tu, Caesar, in alto | caedis adhuc cumulo patriae per viscera vadis*, 7.721-2). It is important to note that Lucan does not attempt to redeem the civil wars by arguing that this former, pre-Caesarian Rome and its characteristic *Libertas* survived or that it can be fully restored. What Lucan *does* do, however, is create a new audience for witnessing this death anew. This epic invites its readers to remember the civil wars that made Rome into what it had become to Lucan's contemporary audience and then consider what they meant—and continue to mean. In this light, the *Bellum Civile* itself takes on the essential function of a funeral monument.

In order to explore the significance of such a memorializing function to Lucan's epic, it will be appropriate first to survey briefly the ways in which Roman funerals and tomb monuments work to preserve memory and pass that on to others who witness that monument. Funerals mark the rite of passage of a person into death, but as a cultural institution they function primarily for the benefit of those who are still living.[27] Donovan Ochs notes how the death of a person, especially one with recognized importance to the community, upsets the "equilibrium of social life" which in turn creates a need for the restoration of that equilibrium and the reassurance of the surviving members of that

[26] Cf. Hershkowitz (1998: 209).

[27] Lindsay (2000) provides a helpful summary of the full funeral process from deathbed to burial to the ninth-day purificatory sacrifice. See also Flower (1996: 91-127), Sumi (2005: 101-2).

community.[28] A dead person cannot be revived, but the *meaning* which that person's life conveys to the rest of the living community is actively shaped by the ways chosen to commemorate the dead.

The best ancient account of a Roman aristocratic funeral during the Republic is the famous description by Polybius (6.53-4), and it is significant that what seems to stand out most to him are those elements that particularly engaged the memory.[29] His account places special attention on the funeral oration (*laudatio funebris*) with its display of *exempla* and the presence of the *imagines maiorum*, wax masks made to resemble the appearances of the dead man's noble ancestors and worn by people who even wore the same togas that the ancestor would have worn.[30] In this way, the dead are given a revived agency for impacting the living. The resulting combination of the funeral speech and the masks (*loci memoriae* of the past glories of the ancestors) functioned to inspire onlookers in the audience—young men especially—to desire to emulate the *virtus* of those who had gone before:

> [53.9] ὅταν δ' ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐμβόλους ἔλθωσι, καθέζονται πάντες ἑξῆς ἐπὶ δίφρων ἐλεφαντίνων. οὗ κάλλιον οὐκ εὐμαρὲς ἰδεῖν θέαμα νέῳ φιλοδόξῳ καὶ φιλαγάθῳ· [10] τὸ γὰρ τὰς τῶν ἐπ' ἀρετῇ δεδοξασμένων ἀνδρῶν εἰκόνας ἰδεῖν ὁμοῦ πάσας οἷον εἰ ζώσας καὶ πεπνυμένας τίν' οὐκ ἂν παραστήσαι; … [54.3] τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, οἱ νέοι παρορμῶνται πρὸς τὸ πᾶν ὑπομένειν ὑπὲρ τῶν

[28] Ochs (1993: 26). He goes on to add that in the wake of general disruption caused by a death in the community, "Anxiety about future relationships can escalate to damaging levels unless and until social, communal bonds are reestablished and reassured." Cf. also Flower (2006:55). This is especially true for figures who are central to the community, and in Lucan it is not merely a significant person but *Roma* herself who is dying, creating an even greater need in the surviving community for commemoration. On the significance of the aristocratic funeral in this regard, see Flower (2004: 331ff).

[29] See Edwards (2007: 19-20).

[30] On the significance of these *imagines*, Flower (1996) is the definitive study; see esp. 16ff and 107-9. Cf. also Lindsay (2000: 164).

> κοινῶν πραγμάτων χάριν τοῦ τυχεῖν τῆς συνακολουθούσης τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐκλείας.
>
> [53.9] And when they [those wearing the wax *imagines maiorum*] reach the *rostra*, they all sit in order on ivory stools. It is not easy for an ambitious and high minded young man to see a finer spectacle than this. [10] For who would not be won over at the sight of all the masks together of those men who had been extolled for virtue as if they were alive and breathing? … [54.3] But the greatest result is that the young men are encouraged to undergo anything for the sake of the common cause in the hope of gaining the good reputation which follows upon the brave deeds of men.[31]

The *funus* essentially becomes a "celebratory drama" of memory with its own embedded narratives, one level of which is essentially didactic.[32] By virtue of preserving *memoria* and keeping the past a living tradition, the *imagines* in turn cast a challenge to the present audience to respond to that memory such that their lives in the future might be worthy of a similar honor, causing the cycle to regenerate.[33] Past, present, and future are bound together into a living whole that cannot die because it is constantly renewing itself through memorialization.[34] When that cycle is broken, however, as in Lucan's epic, *memoria* and thus the future of Rome is in jeopardy.

---

[31] Trans. Harriet Flower (1996: 310).

[32] Cf. Ochs (1993: 94, also 109).

[33] Cf. Ochs (1993: 95): "By juxtaposing the deceased vis-à-vis his ancestors in the funeral speech and the deceased's visage over against the parade of ancestral masks a rhetorical conclusion is asserted: the deceased has now joined company with his collectivity of honored and honorable ancestors and his praiseworthy accomplishments will remain alive, present, and extant so long as the clan and Rome survive." Sallust *Iug*. 4.5 also notes the power of the *imagines*; on this point Meban (2002: 133) notes how "The *imagines*, as Sallust points out, engender noble action not through any sort of inherent power, but rather as a result of the memories they provoke. This practice thus secures a link with the past that, if unbroken, ensures future success. The guardianship of memory therefore becomes a core element in the health of the Republic." Chaplin (2000: 14) rightly connects the use of these *imagines* as both vehicles of memory and thus spurs to action with the Roman use of *exempla* stories.

[34] See especially Polybius 54.2.

The more permanent *monumentum* used to mark the tomb of the deceased was also at its core a memory-preserving tool. Ulpian's *Digest* defines it as follows: "A *monumentum* is something that exists for the sake of preserving memory" (*monumentum est, quod memoriae servandae gratia existat*).[35] This ability, however, relies entirely upon its ability to interact with those who are still alive. Unlike the seclusion of most grave sites today, tomb markers frequently confronted Romans in a much more direct fashion. Streets outside the city were often lined with grave monuments, most famously the Via Appia with its tombs of the Scipios and other famous figures of the Roman past. This public and visual nature made these *monumenta* call out to passersby to read its *inscriptio* and remember the deceased.[36] But it is crucial to realize that this passing of informational content is not the final stage of a merely passive interaction. As its very name suggests, a *monumentum* is intended to pass on a message (*monere*) to those who view it, a message that by its very nature is meant to invite a response in turn from the spectator.[37] It is this interactive dialogue between the present spectator and the remembered deceased that gives a *monumentum* its full dialectic power.[38] It is true that

---

[35] Ulpian, *Digest* 11.7.2.6. For more recent definitions of *monumentum*, see Koortbojian 1996: 210); Jaeger (1997: 16); and especially Corbier (2006: 13): "La function du monument est de transmettre à la postérité le souvenir (*memoria*) d'un événement ou d'une personne – et dans ce cas, d'un nom (*nomen*), mémorable ou non."

[36] Cf. Koortbojian (1996: 233), "It was the exercise of *memoria*—fuelled by the imagery that lines these streets—that transformed these architectural, sculptural and textual elements into a meaningful cultural phenomenon…Faces, names, memories—on these 'streets of tombs' the dead conspired with the living, the past with the present, so that they might bind themselves, across the divide of time, by the evocation of common history." See also Carroll (2006:48ff).

[37] Corbier (2006: 17), "Quant à la tombe elle est le *monumentum* par excellence – celui qui invite, nous l'avons vu, à *monere*, à « faire penser »." Cf. also Miles (1995: 17). For the essentially visual nature of the monument as memories made visible, see Jaeger (1997: 25).

[38] Cf. Carroll (2006: 18), "Memorials to the dead were intended to be seen, read, and engaged with, not only by friends, family, and the descendants of the dead, but also by passing strangers, for generations to come." She goes on to cite (54-5) many examples of tombs inscribed with epitaphs that beseech the viewer

the monument solicits the response of actively remembering, but this call to remember is not merely for its own sake. The ultimate point of much of the Roman memory institutions is to call forth the viewer to modify his or her behavior in response to the enactment of memory.

Given Lucan's focus on narrating the death of Rome and the fact that he does so by forcing his audience to remember this calamity, I propose that we may fruitfully read the *Bellum Civile* as possessing the rhetorical function of a funeral monument. The idea of reading a text as a *monumentum* was nothing new for the Romans, as any inscription carved into a *monumentum* became a text that spoke to its audience. Within the traditional sphere of literature, Horace famously concluded his third book of *Odes* by pronouncing *exegi monumentum aere perennius* (3.30.1), explicitly setting his literary work alongside the traditional physical monument as a preserver of memory and, in this case, the poet's fame. Livy in his preface (*Pr*. 10) also clearly compared his literary *magnum opus* with the physical *monumenta* that dotted the Roman landscape and urged his audience to "view" and respond to his *exempla* as if they were viewing and reading a physical memory-structure.[39] Lucan's epic itself thus stands as a *monumentum* against the threats posed to memory by civil war and the fear of leaders.

The funeral simile that opens Book 2 hints at the uncertainty of the funeral process, for it presents the transition into only the first stage of the Roman funeral ceremony (*sic funere primo*, 2.21) when the body is still on the threshold of recent death. Such an image is appropriate in that the simile stands as a direct response to the

---

to speak the words "*sit tibi terra levis*" out loud, giving force to the principle that "The survival of the memory of the deceased thus required active participation by the viewer in a dialogue *with* the deceased."

[39] Jaeger (1997: 8) offers a sound discussion of "the *Ab Urbe Condita* as a spatial entity, a monument, and a lengthy act of remembering"; cf. also (23ff).

numerous prodigies and prophecies that all forecast defeat for the city. Thus, this is the first moment at which the *populus*, like the stunned household (*attonitae domus*, 2.22), fully recognizes the truth (*ubi concipiunt*, 2.16) that Rome is on her deathbed. This death triggers the memorializing impulse, and accordingly the *funus* begins. Yet, it is also important to note that the simile depicts a situation in limbo, in which the *funus* is more potential than realized fact. We read mostly not of what *has* happened but of what has *not yet* happened (but could still): not yet have the bodies been wept and lamented (*corpora nondum | conclamata iacent*, 2.22-3), nor yet has the mother with her hair unbound bid her servants to beat their arms in mourning (*nec mater crine soluto | exigit ad saevos famularum bracchia planctus*, 2.23-4). In essence, the *funus* has begun to move toward the subsequent stages of remembering and memorializing, but such a successful outcome is still far from assured. We have already seen the mob's mad rush to flee the city, an action in which they abandon their families and ancestral gods, namely all their memorials to past Roman identity. We are left to wonder who will remain in the midst of the chaos to see the *funus* through and ensure that the memorial to Rome is erected and survives into future generations. Civil war renders the need to remember the *virtutes maiorum* through *exempla* and the need to memorialize the dead through *funera* all the more critical. As Lucan's text reveals, however, civil war makes such actions all the more difficult.

The Parade of Fear: Book 2

In the section that follows, Lucan presents his readers with three different groups of people—the matrons, soldiers, and elders of Rome—each of which speaks out in turn

with regard to the coming disaster.[40] The matrons are the first to come forward (2.28-42). At the end of a brief description of general mourning and beseeching of the gods by the city's mothers, one of them steps forward and issues a sinister prediction of her own:

> 'Nunc', ait 'o miserae, contundite pectora, matres,
> nunc laniate comas neve hunc differte dolorem
> et summis servate malis. Nunc flere potestas
> dum pendet fortuna ducum: cum vicerit alter,
> gaudendum est.' his se stimulis dolor ipse lacessit. (2.38–42)

> She said, "Beat your breasts *now*, O miserable mothers! *Now* tear your hair! Don't put this grief off and end up saving it for even greater evils! Now you have the power to weep so long as the fortunes of the leaders hang in the balance… when one of them becomes *victor*, then there must be rejoicing." By these stings, Grief itself goaded itself into a frenzy.

Here too *dolor* is presented as literally in control over the women, a point emphasized by *ipse*, as their fear and grief build upon each other. More significantly, this powerlessness extends to the threatened ideal of *libertas*, one of the core concerns to Lucan's epic. The matron makes it clear that when a *victor* is established in this civil war, everyone will be forced to suppress their true feelings and put on a show of joy for the civil war's winner—the very person who is the reason for their defeat.[41] This image offers another example of the "fear of the leader" (*ductoris metu*, 1.356) that previously held Caesar's soldiers on course to participate in the defeat of Rome, although here it is the losing side that is constrained by such fear.

The second voice of mourning belongs to the soldiers (2.43-64) as they march out of the city to war. Although destined soon to become enemies as they seek opposite camps (*diversaque castra petentes*, 2.43), Lucan allows them, at this last moment of unity

---

[40] For overviews on these three groups of laments, see Fantham (1992: 84-90), Schmitt (1995: 29-40), Narducci (2002: 116-9), Radicke (2004: 200-4).

[41] Cf. Bartsch (1997: 60).

before war splits them violently apart, to cry forth in a single, shared voice, united in horror at the coming calamity. Their words focus on defeat like those of the women before them, but appropriately the men express their dismay within a military rather than domestic context. Aiming their "just complaints" (*iustas querellas*) at the savage gods (*numina saeva*) (2.44), the soldiers repeatedly declare their preference of any kind of war or foreign invasion over the horrible self-destruction unique to civil war. Contrasting past with the present, they consider themselves wretched for not being born in the days when Romans marched off to fight Hannibal at Cannae or Trebia, for at least those soldiers of the past could face off against foreign enemies instead of their own countrymen (*o miserae sortis quod non in Punica nati | tempora Cannarum fuimus Trebiaeque iuventus*, 2.45-6). Significantly, the two battles chosen to represent the "happier times," Cannae and Trebia, were two of the most crushing defeats the Romans suffered at the hands of Hannibal. With this comparison, the men seem to recognize that they are destined for even greater defeats than those of the Punic Wars, and they march forth in despair from the city resigned to their self-destruction. One soldier's cry encapsulates their shared sentiments: *omnibus hostes | reddite nos populis: civile avertite bellum!* (2.52-3) The gods are petitioned to inflict any enemy or disaster upon Rome, even one like Cannae, so long as they avert civil war. As a last resort they even beseech Jupiter to destroy both Caesar and Pompey so that there will no need to fight civil war (2.59-61).[42] What drives such a fervent plea is *pietas peritura* (2.63). This phrase

[42] Narducci (2002: 118) recognizes here another grotesque paradox of civil war in that Romans are beseeching the gods to save Roman lives by annihilating Roman leaders: "nella guerra civile non si invoca la morte di *un* nemico *esterno*, ma quella di *ambedue* i capifazione che minacciano di dilacerare la comunità."

encapsulates the true cost of waging civil war.[43] *Pietas* had already fallen away with Caesar's soldiers, and now these new soldiers on the threshold of participating in civil war for themselves are about to experience the same thing.

Lucan then brings forward his final group, the *senes parentes* of the city, to encapsulate the full extent of the damage that civil war will inflict upon *Roma* and her people. Like the two groups before them, they also speak from their own hard-won experience and haunted memories of the lessons of the past. One of the *senes*, "seeking past models for great fear" (*magno quaerens exempla timori*, 2.67) delivers the longest lament of all, the flashback episode that looks back through public memory to the violent purges of Marius and Sulla (2.64–233). These scenes are the first that depict fighting and bloodshed in the epic and thus serve as the prototype of civil war.

Marius's triumphant entry into Rome brought nothing less than an unmitigated bloodbath for the people inside. All perished alike by the sword, with no respect paid to class (*nobilitas cum plebe perit*, 2.101) or age (*nulli sua profuit aetas*, 2.104) as the rich and poor, the elderly and infant, spilled their blood in the streets. Not even the sanctity of the temples was spared (*stat cruor in templis multaque rubentia caede | lubrica saxa madent*, 2.103-4).[44] Lucan sums up the gruesome extent of the slaughter when he has the

---

[43] The crucial importance of *pietas* for the healthy functioning of the state is illustrated in the simile Vergil uses at *Aeneid* 1.148-54 when Neptune calms the waves in response to storms that had been whipped up at the instigation of Juno: just as when *seditio* arises in a *populus* and the common people rage (*saevitque animis ignobile vulgus*), should they then fix their gaze upon a man honored for his *pietas* and past service, they fall silent (*tum pietate gravem ac meritis si forte virum quem | conspexere, silent arrectisque auribus instant*). In Vergil, the man of *pietas* calms the crowd and brings order to the chaos that threatens to overwhelm him, but in Lucan *pietas peritura est*, and there is nobody to stop the raging of the people and thus nothing to stop the destructive chain reaction that results. Cf. Goar (1987: 25-6) who suggests that this Vergilian simile might in fact be referencing Cato in addition to Augustus.

[44] The people fare no better upon Sulla's subsequent entry into Rome; cf. 2.145-7: *tum data libertas odiis, resolutaque legum | frenis ira ruit. non uni cuncta dabuntur | sed fecit sibi quisque nefas*. Note the striking similarity between this last phrase and *naufragium sibi quisque facit* (1.503) seen above in reference to the

elderly speaker ask, "For what crime could the little ones have earned their slaughter?" (*crimine quo parvi caedem potuere mereri?* 2.108) The reply is chilling in its cruel simplicity: "But it was enough that they *could* die" (*sed satis est iam posse mori*, 2.109). The ultimate disgrace inflicted upon the defeated was for their heads to be severed and be carried around as symbols of victory (2.111-3).[45] In the face of such death and dismemberment, "the one hope of safety was to fix trembling kisses upon the befouled sword-hand" of the *victor* (*spes una salutis | oscula pollutae fixisse trementia dextrae*, 2.113-4). This debasing display, an *exemplum* for the *servitudo* the matron predicted in her earlier speech, is duly condemned by the speaker (2.115-8). He begins by addressing such people who would do this as "*degener o populus*" (2.116), and concludes by declaring that such shameful behavior would hardly be justifiable even if it guaranteed a long life, let alone in this case the paltry prize of a brief, disgraced life until Sulla would return to snatch it away for good (*vix saecula longa decorum | sic meruisse viris, nedum breve dedecus aevi | et vitam dum Sulla redit*, 2.116-8).[46] Such people show themselves willing to pay any price, no matter how degrading, in their fear-guided attempts to flee their own destruction.

As Lucan points out, the irony for these "survivors" is that such an attempt for safety is ultimately mistaken—not only will it require the defeated ones to honor the *victor* in a show of *servitude*, but it will also prove a frighteningly temporary reward.

---

people's fear-driven response at Caesar's approach. Lucan's language suggests that both the *victor* and *victus* are ultimately responsible for their own respective disasters.

[45] This passage establishes the *caput recisum* as the symbol *par excellence* for the would-be *victor* in civil war. I will discuss the significance of the severed head in Lucan more fully in the next chapter.

[46] As the old man's recollection soon shows, Sulla's entry does in fact continue the wholesale and indiscriminate slaughter of the *populus*, culminating in the massacre of *flos Hesperiae, Latii iam sola iuventus* (2.196) in the Campus Martius that wounds *Roma* herself, rendering her *misera* (2.197).

Civil war brings defeat and destruction to all parties involved. When the people of Rome recognize that Caesar's approach in fact means their defeat, they react with terror and flight. As a result, their fear-driven response sparks a chain reaction that progresses through the end of Book 1 and into Book 2, revealing the consequences of such a response that move from debilitating grief to the virtual decapitation of Rome's leadership on to the loss of their *libertas* and ultimately to the abandonment of Roman *pietas*. The way in which the people respond to imminent defeat ultimately threatens to emasculate the core values that shape Roman identity—specifically in Lucan the identity of a Rome that is still in full possession of *libertas*—and quietly push them into oblivion. What must be recognized is that *pietas peritura* points to not one but two critical dangers. First, pre-Caesarian Rome is not only doomed to defeat but it is also doomed to die. No different response on the part of the people can change this outcome. What is left to be decided, however, is what the defeat and death of Rome will *mean*. Lucan demonstrates that as the Roman people choose to abandon *pietas* they begin to forget the links to their past that help define what Rome *is*. It is this threat of *oblivio* that represents the greatest and gravest consequence of the fear-driven reaction to imminent defeat. Rome is in danger not only of being defeated and perishing but of being *forgotten*, a condition which would render a perished Rome *truly* dead for all generation to come.

CHAPTER 4
SEVERED HEADS AND FAILED FUNERALS (2.67–233)

The Search for *Exempla*

Book 2 opens with a depiction of the Roman people captured by their own fear even before Caesar actually reaches the city. They are terrified over the question of what will happen to them now that civil war is actually breaking out. What the epic provides as a possible answer to this terrible question turns out to be an enactment of memory. As already mentioned in the previous chapter, an anonymous member of the *parentes* of the city (2.64) steps forward and gives voice to the terrible realization that his generation has lived long enough just to be preserved for another civil war:

> at miseros angit sua cura parentes,
> oderuntque gravis vivacia fata senectae
> servatosque iterum bellis civilibus annos.
> atque aliquis magno quaerens exempla timori
> 'non alios' inquit 'motus tum fata parabant
> cum post Teutonicos victor Libycosque triumphos
> exul limosa Marius caput abdidit ulva.' (2.64-70)

> But their own separate cares torment the fathers; they hated both the long-lived doom of weighty old age as well as the fact that their years have been saved for civil wars all over again. And one of them seeking *exempla* for their great fear spoke up: "No different were the upheavals that the fates were preparing back when Marius—once a victor with German and Libyan triumphs— in exile hid his head in the marshy sedge."

Thus the epic narrative moves into a vivid flashback of the terrifying purges conducted in the 80s BC first by Marius and then by Sulla.[1] These past conflicts, even though they come inside a lengthy speech, are introduced as "civil wars" (*bellis civilibus*, 2.66) and notably comprise the first full-blown combat narrative in the epic. As such, this

[1] On this speech in general, see Tasler (1972: 235-47), Fantham (1992: 90-121), Schmitt (1995: 41-79), Narducci (2002: 116-26), Radicke (2004: 204-7), Gowing (2005: 85-6), Casamento (2005).

description of past civil war functions as a programmatic model for our reading of the coming civil war.[2] Furthermore, this speech that immediately precedes Cato's entry into the epic is one great display of memory, making it a fruitful place to explore the ways in which the epic interacts with themes of memory.[3] In this chapter I will analyze elements in this flashback narrative (2.67-233), most notably images of beheading and suicide. These images will vividly illustrate the continued subversion of victory into defeat as well as the dangers that threaten attempts to memorialize the dead in civil war.

Lucan describes the speaker as specifically "seeking *exempla* [that apply] to their great fear." The use of the term *exemplum* is crucial in helping us to read this speech correctly, for it lays out what the speaker intends for it to accomplish for his audience.[4] It will thus be useful to provide a brief survey of the Roman *exemplum* here. The *exemplum*, much like the wax masks of the ancestors in the Roman funeral, encapsulates a story of a past person or event that displays a specific virtue (or a lack thereof) in action and transmits that to an audience who, upon recalling the *exemplum*, will then desire to emulate his or her ancestors in doing virtuous and praiseworthy deeds themselves. The

---

[2] Given the programmatic nature of the speech regarding what civil war does to the citizen body (literally and figuratively), it is surprising that most who have done studies on this flashback do not make more of this fact. Fantham (1992), Schmitt (1995), and Casamento (2005)—whose whole book uses the speech as a starting point for study of various themes throughout Lucan—are notable exceptions in this regard. Schmitt (1995: 42-3) also points to passages in Cicero (e.g. *ad Att*. 7.7.7, 8.11.2, 9.14.12) in which the civil wars of Marius and Sulla are brought up as a potential model for the struggle between Caesar and Pompey; cf. also Fantham (1992: 91).

[3] This speech is the longest in all of Lucan, coming in at 164 ½ lines; cf. Tesler (1972: 235). The fact that such a speech is itself an act of memory is strong evidence that Lucan wishes to engage the issue of memory and mark it as a central one for his readers.

[4] Cf. Schmitt (1995: 42).

exemplum is thus essentially didactic in function.[5] We can find a clear example of this didactic force behind the *monumentum* in the prologue to Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*. In laying out his plan for remembering the history of Rome from earliest times to the present, Livy explicitly draws an analogy between the *exemplum* story (which his history will employ extensively) and the tangible, physical *monumentum*. He writes (*Pr. 10*) that the very purpose of his history is to serve as a kind of literary *monumentum*—as a facilitator of memory.[6] This literary *monumentum*, Livy tells us, is full of every kind of *exemplum* (*omnis…exempli documenta*) from which you can see what should be imitated (*quod imitere*) and what should be avoided (*quod vites*). The *exempla* contained in his histories are thus beneficial and fruitful (*salubre ac frugiferum*) for those who look upon them and consider them regarding their own lives.[7] In short, an *exemplum* invites the viewer to assess his or her outlook or behavior in light of an illustrative model and modify that outlook or behavior accordingly. By recalling the memory of what has gone before (literally *res gestae*), *exempla* aim to teach others *in the present* what should be imitated and what should be avoided in the future.[8]

Cicero spells out the importance of *exempla* in the creation and maintenance of the *mos maiorum* in the opening prologue to his *De Republica*. Citing *exempla* of famous

---

[5] Bartsch (2006: 117ff) has a succinct summary of the significance of the *exemplum* in Roman culture, with special attention paid to its intimate connection to visibility and sight (thus noting the necessity of an audience for the *exemplum*).

[6] Miles (1995) is a good starting place for a study of this passage in Livy's preface; cf. also Chaplin (2000: 1ff).

[7] Livy Pr. 10: *hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum. omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod uites*.

[8] Jaeger (1997:24) explains the forces at play as follows: "A clear and comprehensive vision from the appropriate distance produces insight, and insight produces movement. The reader is expected to act after establishing his or her spatial coordinates, to continue on in the direction indicated by the monument by choosing what to imitate and what to avoid (*unde*, *exitus*, and *vitare* all imply movement)."

Romans who had committed themselves to serving the state, he pauses to consider Cato the Elder "by whom, as if he were the very *exemplar* of them, all of us who yearn zealously for the same things are led to diligence and *virtus*" (*quo omnes, qui isdem rebus studemus, quasi exemplari ad industriam virtutemque ducimur*, 1.1.1).[9] As evidenced in these passages, the ideal of the *exemplum*—just like the Roman *funus*— is that it creates a living memory that engenders *virtus* in the one who remembers the person or situation to which the *exemplum* refers. Likewise, for a Roman, *virtus* depends upon memory, for how can a young man learn what *virtus* is unless he should be able to look upon the *exempla* of his *maiores*?[10]

In the realm of epic, Vergil's *Aeneid* provides a clear example of how the *exemplum* worked. In Book 3, when Aeneas comes across Helenus and a sort of "Little Troy" he has rebuilt, his wife Andromache asks Aeneas if young Ascanius is still alive, and if so, does he remember his mother, and do the thoughts of his father Aeneas and his dead uncle Hector spur him on to "the *virtus* of old": *ecquid in antiquam virtutem animosque viriles | et pater Aeneas et avunculus excitat Hector?* (3.342-3)[11] These two men, whether alive or dead, can be *exempla* that spur on (*excitat*) the younger generation

---

[9] See also Cicero's later discussion of the value of *exempla* at 5.1.1: *itaque ante nostram memoriam et mos ipse patrius praestantes viros adhibebat, et veterem morem ac maiorum instituta retinebant excellentes viri*. Commenting on this passage, Meban (2002: 133) observes: "What Cicero outlines here is an undisturbed mnemonic process. Romans, in other words, stored in their memory the ways of their ancestors and passed them on to future generations. It is the maintenance of this link between past and present, then, that creates stability and well-being."

[10] For evidence of the central importance of *exempla* to Roman thinking, one need look no further than the writings of Valerius Maximus, who composed nine full books of exempla entitled *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*. On this engaging collection of what one early imperial author thought was important for people of his time, see Bloomer (1992); also Gowing (2005: 49-62).

[11] Cf. Hardy (1991: 110): "For Aeneas, in Book 3, the past literally provides guidance—he sets his course by it. For the Roman of Vergil's day, the past provided moral guidance by revealing examples of Roman *virtus*. Ideally, then, memory of the past can be converted into a positive stimulus to present action, by providing a model for that action."

to positive action on behalf of the *familia* and the *patria*. When the models are corrupted, however, as in the flashback memory of Marius and Sulla, the *exempla* of the past can only perpetuate negative behaviors that work against the health of the state.

Severed Heads and Civil War

The anonymous speaker begins his memorial with Marius brooding in Africa and quickly moves to Marius's bloody entry into Roma. The words used here hearken back to the proem, for they characterize Marius's followers as men accustomed to *usum scelerum* (2.97) and *nefas* (2.98).[12] The signal word, however, is *victor*, applied to the *imperator* right at the moment of his entry into the city—at the moment when his acts of civil war begin: *pro fata, quis ille, quis fuit ille dies, Marius quo moenia victor | corripuit* (2.98–100).[13] Naming Marius as a *victor* in civil war draws explicit comparisons to the proem's picture of the victor's self-defeat and the impossibility of any real glory or triumph in such a conflict.

This picture is confirmed by the first appearance of severed heads in the episode:

> trahit ipse furoris
> impetus, et visum lenti quaesisse nocentem.
> in numerum pars magna perit, rapuitque cruentus
> victor ab ignota vultus cervice recisos
> dum vacua pudet ire manu… (2.109–113)

> The rush of *furor* itself drove each one on; seeking charges against the "guilty" made one look soft. A great part of the people perished just to fill a quota, and the blood-soaked *victor* snatched up severed heads right from an anonymous neck since it would have been an embarrassment to go around with one's hand empty…

[12] Cf. *iusque datum sceleri* (1.2) and *in commune nefas* (1.6).

[13] Cf. Casamento (2005: 96-7). The enjambment helps mark the title of *victor* as significant. Note also its placement as the first or last word at 2.112, 2.157, 2.203.

In this programmatic model of civil war—of a society caught in the paradox of self-destruction—this *victor* is not the stereotypical hero of epic but is instead qualified as a *cruentus victor* (2.111–112). This hero bloodied and stained by his acts of *nefas*, a man dragged by *furor* (*trahit ipse furoris impetus*). This anonymous *victor* seeks to snatch up an equally anonymous severed head (*ab ignota cervice*) simply to avoid the perceived shame of not having one in hand as evidence of the victory (*dum vacua pudet ire manu*). Lucan makes it clear that the severed head has become the foremost prize of war and the chief evidence that one is indeed the *victor*. At the same time, however, Lucan's choice to establish the severed head of a fellow citizen as the symbolic *spolium* for civil war categorically denies the *victor* any of the *gloria* typically associated with epic victory. In a civil war in which the object of conquest is one's own people, the severed head represents the dismemberment of the body politic and thus the annulment of the *victor*'s victory.[14] Even though being able to hold aloft the severed head of one's enemy is evidence of total domination and dismemberment of an opponent's power and even existence, in civil war this is yet an even more powerful symbol of self-annihilation.[15]

Lucan's next scene (2.118–129) continues to emphasize the grotesqueness of the severed head as a symbol of victory. In this passage we find another anonymous victorious soldier swinging around the severed head of the elder M. Antonius by its torn

[14] Cf. Schmitt (1995: 57), "Was die Mutter schon aussprach, daß nach dem Sieg gleich welcher Partei kein Platz mehr für eine individuelle Äußerung bleibt, scheint auch hier wieder durch: Das Volk kann in diesem Kampf nur verlieren."

[15] Any appearance of the severed head—or its counterpart, the headless corpse (*truncus*)—connected with the civil wars in the Roman imagination cannot help but bring to mind the beheading of Pompey (in Lucan 8.560–662). Lucan first employs the imagery at 1.685–686 in direct reference to Pompey when the Roman matron gives her prophecy of the disasters to come: *hunc ego, fluminea deformis truncus harena | qui iacet, agnosco*. Vergil certainly took advantage of the connection in his famous description of Priam's death: *iacet ingens litore truncus,| avulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus* (*Aeneid* 2.557–558). In the same fashion, any visible reference to suicide in the civil wars will invoke one of the most remembered and celebrated events in the entire war, the suicide of Cato at Utica. Because of this, Lucan's employment of both of these images is highly significant to our understanding of the epic.

hair until he plops its blood-dripping face down onto a feasting table (*ora ferens miles festae rorantia mensae | imposuit*, 2.123–124). Lucan enhances the grotesque effect by vividly juxtaposing the gruesome (*ora rorantia*) with the festive (*festae mensae*), as if the severed head were to be the main dish in a feast for the *victores*.[16] The very next description of slaughter forms a natural counterpart, for in it a certain C. Flavius Fimbria rips apart the corpses of P. Licinius Crassus and his son (*truncos laceravit Fimbria Crassos*, 2.124). The pairing of *truncus* with the severed head of the preceding scene highlights its specific reference to a *headless* corpse. Already beheaded, the hacked bodies of the Crassi are subjected to further assault.

The narrator then shifts to Sulla's entry into Roma and his own enactment of civil war. Once again the speaker invokes the vocabulary of the proem, indicating that Sulla's conquest of Roma is on par with that of Marius.[17] Just as in the proem law was forced to yield to crime (*iusque datum sceleri*, 1.2), so too here the spirit of vengeful rage breaks free from the boundaries of law and runs rampant (*tum data libertas odiis, resolutaque legum | frenis ira ruit*, 2.145-146). Again we find *nefas* at the center (*non uni cuncta dabantur | sed fecit sibi quisque nefas*, 2.146-147). Most importantly, Lucan displays this *nefas* as the direct work of the epic victor: *semel omnia victor iusserat* (2.147-148). It is not surprising that the severed head remains the most visible and most sought after *spolium* to commemorate Sulla's victory over his fellow citizens.

---

[16] Cf. Schmitt (1995: 60) who calls this death one of the many "Beispeil für die Greuel des Bürgerkrieges." This foreshadows Caesar's victorious feast amidst the dead at Pharsalus (7.792-4); cf. Fantham (1992: 104).

[17] The comparison is explicit, *Sulla quoque immensis accessit cladibus ultor* (2.139). It can even be argued that Sulla commits greater crimes than Marius, as if to suggest that each successive act of civil war is more heinous than the last, adding all the more fear to the people awaiting Caesar's arrival. The narrative does in fact devote more space to Sulla's activities (2.134–222, 89 lines) than to those of Marius (2.70–133, 64 lines).

What follows is a catalogue of six gruesome deaths in quick succession (2.148–159), split equally into two groups. The first three share in common the fact that the killers and the ones who are killed are from the same household:

> (1) infandum domini per viscera ferrum
> exegit famulus, (2) nati maduere paterno
> sanguine, certatum est cui cervix caesa parentis
> cederet, (3) in fratrum ceciderunt praemia fratres. (2.148–151)

> …(1) a servant drove the unspeakable sword through the guts of his master; (2) sons got soaked through with paternal blood as they fought each other to see who would be the one to whom the parent's severed neck would yield; (3) brothers pounced upon brothers for rewards.

Together these murders, all committed within the *familia*, show that Sulla's conquest of Roma is the virtual reenactment of the proem's three characterizations of civil war (1.2–4): crime replacing law (2.146), the victorious sword hand of a powerful people attacking their own *viscera* (2.148), and kin slaying kin (2.149–151).[18] Nestled right in the midst of this is the grotesque picture of a father's severed head (*cervix caesa parentis*) as the object of a perverted struggle waged by his sons who are themselves "slick with paternal blood" (*nati maduere paterno sanguine*). These murders are all assaults upon *pietas*, illustrating yet again the self-destruction of Rome and the social ties that bind her together. Within Lucan's economy of defeat, the severed head comes to function as civil war's foremost prize and thus as its most vivid symbol of what it will do for Rome and for all those who get involved.

The other set of three deaths in the catalogue deserve special attention, for they are all suicides:

---

[18] Cf. Tasler (1972: 242) finds in these *exempla* of Sulla's purges similarities to those of Marius: "Ähnlich wie im ersten Teil der Rede erscheinen nun Beispiele, aber sie führen keine Einzelfälle mehr an, sondern allgemein übliche Erscheinungen: den Mord des Dieners an seinem Herrn, des Sohnes am Vater, des Bruders am Bruder (v.148-151)."

> (4) hic laqueo fauces elisaque guttura fregit,
> (5) hic se praecipiti iaculatus pondere dura
> dissiluit percussus humo, mortisque cruento
> victori rapuere suas; (6) hic robora busti
> exstruit ipse sui necdum omni sanguine fuso
> desilit in flammas et, dum licet, occupant ignes. (2.154–159)

> (4) This one here crushed his gullet and shattered his throat with a noose; (5) this one there shooting himself forth with his own weight leapt head-first and was crushed by the ground, snatching his own means of dying from the blood-stained *victor*; (6) this one here piled up the wood for his own funeral pyre himself before all his blood had poured out and leapt into the flames to claim his fires while it was still permitted to him.

One hangs himself, another leaps to his death, and the final victim ignites his own funeral pyre while still alive. As the first actual suicides narrated in the epic, this passage is itself a model for understanding suicide's place and meaning in the poem. Lucan's epic compels the reader throughout to keep two crucial scenes of suicide in mind, that of civil war's *victor* (as begun in the proem) and that of Cato still to come at Utica. These three scenes of suicide here further invoke the proem's image of civil war as the people's self-destruction, but they introduce a crucial new element. Unlike the proem, which depicted the *victor* inadvertently killing himself by means of his victory, this passage depicts people who recognize their defeat and yet kill themselves as a direct consequence of their opposition to the *victor*. Their motivation distinguishes them: *mortisque cruento victori rapuere suas*. These individuals deny the "blood-stained *victor*" the ability to claim their deaths as a prize. In other words, it is their hope that the *victor* cannot claim a triumph over the *victus* who still manages freely to control his own death.[19]

[19] This was the historical Cato's reported motivation for committing suicide, for he did not want to lose the dignity of his personal *libertas* to Caesar's infamous *clementia* (Plutarch, *Cato* 66.2). On Caesar's famous clementia, see Konstan (2005) and Toher (2006: 35-6). Cf. Fantham (1992: 109); Schmitt (1995: 67) who names this passage in Lucan as an example of "die Freitodthematik." Overall, suicide as a model in which the defeated party can oppose the winner is one that looms large in Lucan's epic, especially with regard to Cato. On suicide as a possible course of virtuous resistance against the victor, see in general Hill (2004:

The following section of the flashback (2.160-193) once again focuses on the severed head as a perverted symbol of victory in civil war, this time by vividly depicting a grisly parade of severed heads fixed to pikes paraded through the city and then dumped in the Forum (*colla ducum pilo trepidam gestata per urbem | et medio congesta foro*, 2.160–161). These are specifically identified as the "necks of the leaders," representing in essence the beheading of the leadership of Rome by the *victor*.[20] This action sparks a corpse-hunt throughout the city as families of the slain try to match head to trunk (2.166–168). In a moving passage, the anonymous narrator recalls how he "reviewed all the ranks of the cadavers of Sulla's peace," searching for the body to match his brother's head (*omnia Sullanae lustrasse cadavera pacis | perque omnis truncos, cum qua cervice recisum | conveniat, quaesisse, caput*, 2.171–173). The irony behind *Sullanae pacis* is palpable. Piles of rotting corpses and families rent apart are the rewards of "peace" that civil war brought.[21]

The final image of beheading comes at the horrifying climax of the episode when the victorious Sulla orders the mass deaths of his enemies in the Campus Martius:[22]

> densi vix agmina vulgi
> inter et exangues immissa morte catervas
> victores movere manus; vix caede peracta
> procumbunt, dubiaque labant cervice; sed illos

7ff), Edwards (2007: 35ff *et passim*). However, I propose that Lucan is building for his Cato a larger purpose than merely claiming freedom of action over his own death.

[20] Fantham (1992: 110), rightly points out that this text in particular foreshadows Pompey's fate; cf. Gnaeus Pompey's account at 9.137–139: *gestata per urbem | ora ducis, quae transfixo sublimia pilo | vidimus*. It is fitting that the leaders' head be piled in the Forum, subverting the political heart of the city into a virtual graveyard.

[21] Cf. Schmitt (1995: 68-9). As seen in this passage, *pax* in Lucan's epic is frequently not a good or desirable thing, because in a civil war it can only be bought at the price of naming a *victor*—and thus a master; cf. 1.670: *cum domino pax venit*.

[22] Tasler (1972: 244) calls this passage with its grotesque absurdities the "absoluten Höhepunkten der gesamten Rede."

> magna premit strages peraguntque cadavera partem
> caedis: viva graves elidunt corpora trunci. (2.201–206)

> Amidst the ranks of the tightly-packed mob—and the soldiers blanching white at the death unleashed—the victorious hands/bands could barely move! After the slaughter was completed, the bodies had difficulty even falling over, tottering with their necks every which way; but the great, ruinous heap pressed down on them and the corpses carried out their own share of the slaughter.

No specific mention is made of severed heads, but the focus on the victims' *dubia cervice* and the use of *trunci* to describe the dead vividly evoke the image.[23] Furthermore, these deaths belong to the common people (*densi vulgi*), thus forming a direct counterpart to the earlier scene of beheading when the "heads of the leaders" (*colla ducum*, 2.160) are paraded into the Forum. In this way, Lucan has taken care to show that the *victor*'s suicidal blow has fallen upon both the *Senatus* and the *Populus*—the "head" and "body" of Roma.[24] The poet is also clear in noting that these agents of death are *victores manus*. *Manus* here is usually translated along the lines of "bands" (of men), but in this connection with *victor* it is another clear reference to the proem with its self-defeating *victrici dextra* (1.3).[25] As a result, this gruesome finale to Sulla's victory, complete with images of beheading, stands as the culminating prize that the victor has won for himself in civil war. Yet its effect, far from bringing the desired *gloria* to the victor, is instead to

---

[23] Cf. Lucan's frequent use of *cervix* in describing previous beheadings in the episode (2.112, 150, 172). See Leigh (1997: 301-3) on the many Vergilian parallels to be found in this passage.

[24] It is interesting to compare Lucan's treatment of head/body imagery with Seneca's analogy in *De Clementia* 1.3.3-4.2; Seneca understandably places Nero rather than senatorial *patres* in the role of the head of state, describing this head as "the chain by which the entire *respublica* coheres" (*ille est enim vinculum per quod res publica cohaeret*, 1.4.1). Furthermore, Seneca goes on to say that it is the role of the whole body to be subservient to the needs and safety of the head, essentially redefining *pietas* as one's duty to the *princeps* first and foremost, for one's relationship with him is the one that truly matters for the health of the *patria*. This offers a clear illustration of the kind of loss of senatorial *libertas* Lucan laments and retaliates against throughout the epic.

[25] On manus as "bands", see for example Joyce's (1993: 37) translation: "squadrons paling as death was unleashed, victors could scarcely maneuver…"

leave the city, now named "miserable Roma," stained with blood (*et miserae maculavit Ovilia Romae*, 2.197). By helping destroy his own nation, the *victor* can indeed claim the *nullos triumphos* promised by the proem (1.12).[26]

Failed Victories & Failed Funerals: The Sea Battle at Massilia (3.509–762)

While describing the various other deaths, the speaker of the flashback lingers over a painfully detailed description of the horrible mutilations inflicted upon Marius Gratidianus (2.174–193).[27] His attackers, not content with merely killing their victim, proceed to wrench off his hands, cut out his tongue, slice off his ears and nose, and finally gouge out his eyeballs. Lucan's speaker concludes in horrific amazement:

> vix erit ulla fides tam saevi criminis, unum
> tot poenas cepisse caput. sic mole ruinae
> fracta sub ingenti miscentur pondere membra,
> nec magis informes veniunt ad litora trunci
> qui medio periere freto. (2.186–190)

> There will scarcely be any belief in so savage an accusation, that one head took in so many punishments! His body parts looked like they had been crushed under a structure's ruinous collapse, pulped underneath its huge weight—in no greater state of deformation do *trunci* come to shore which have perished in open water.

The appearance of *trunci* here is rich with meaning. On the surface, it is a simple reference to the severing of Marius's hands (*avulsae cecidere manus*, 2.181). However, any reference to a *truncus* lying *in litore* in Latin epic cannot help but also bring to mind

---

[26] The speaker also complains against the fact that this very same Sulla was honored with a tomb monument upon the Campus Martius (*his meruit tumulum medio sibi tollere Campo?*, 2.222). Such a tomb in honor of a destroyer of Rome who initiated the demise of her liberty (cf. 9.204-5) is a poignant example of a memorial subverted from its ability to offer others a positive model of behavior into one that can only offer a negative model. See Rudich (1997: 151), who draws out Lucan's clear allusion to Augustus's own famous *tumulus* on the Campus Martius; cf. also Henderson (1998: 178).

[27] He was Marius's adoptive nephew and heir; these punishments against him are sheer acts of unrestrained vengeance.

Vergil's famous depiction of Priam's headless corpse lying on the sands, a scene that gains much of its power by its own clear reference to Pompey's beheading.[28] Thus through this allusion, Marius's *truncus* naturally evokes the image of headlessness and foreshadows the mutilation and beheading of Pompey. Lucan's portrayals of the deaths of both Marius and Pompey again follow the pattern of subverting the *victor*'s pursuit of victory by focusing almost exclusively on the horror of the victim's dismemberment. In a very real way, Lucan shows us that the true product produced by victory in civil is not *gloria* at all but instead a mutilated *truncus*, the poet's chosen image for civil war's self-destructive and self-defeating nature.

This lesson takes on far greater immediacy when we realize that the comparison of Marius's shattered corpse to *trunci* washing ashore after a sea battle does not only foreshadow the death of Pompey but also looks directly ahead to Lucan's description of the sea battle at Massilia which closes Book 3 (3.509–762).[29] The closing image Lucan leaves for his readers describes the battle's grim aftermath in which local Massilian families grieve pitifully over the unknown, mutilated dead as they wash ashore. Such a scene of anguish essentially brings the earlier allusion in Book 2 vividly to life. Its presence invites Lucan's reader to compare both episodes and read this latter sea battle too—ostensibly between Greek Massilians and Romans—as a civil war battle in its own right, one in which we witness the same characteristic effects of civil war at work.

---

[28] *iacet ingens litore truncus* (*Aeneid* 2.557–558). Note some of the verbal similarities between the sea battle casualties here in Book 2 and the matron's prophecy of Pompey's death at 1.685–686: *hunc ego, fluminea deformis truncus harena | qui iacet, agnosco*. In both situations, there is a *truncus*, one *informis* and the other *deformis*, both of which come to rest on watery sands (*ad litora* in Book 2, *fluminea harena* in Book 1). See later in this chapter on some even stronger allusions to Pompey's corpse in Lucan's treatment of the Battle of Massilia in Book 3.

[29] For an analysis of the naval battle in Book 3, see Opelt (1957), Rowland (1969: 207-8), Masters (1991: 34-42), Hunink (1992: 198ff).

At first glance, it might seem that a battle between Massilians and Romans ought not be read as a civil war narrative, yet a closer examination will reveal that the battle and its outcome take on numerous characteristics shared by the flashback narrative of Book 2.[30] The strongest evidence of this lies in the narrative's repeated and skilful use of images of self-defeat and dismemberment such as those seen earlier in the flashback sequence of Book 2. Lucan gives us the first such image right at the start of the battle when the Greek ships attempt to ram Brutus's flagship. Instead of successfully sinking it, however, the Greek ships fatally embed themselves in the enemy's hull and cannot escape; in so doing they become *ictu victa suo* (3.564, "defeated by their own blow").[31] Lucan thus chooses to describe this initial encounter through the programmatic vocabulary of self-defeat he has consistently used to characterize the waging of civil war. The sea battle reads in fact as a veritable recreation of civil war on water.[32] Lucan litters his rushing narrative with scenes of destruction and dismemberment that result repeatedly in that noted product of civil war, the *truncus*. At various points in the wild melee, hands

---

[30] Masters (1991: 40) clearly states the issue: "Because Lucan has carefully avoided mentioning either Domitius or Nasidius, the Massilians are pure Massilians. Moreover, Lucan is insistent on their Phocaean origins, so this is a battle between Greeks and Romans. How, then, is this a civil-war battle?" Masters answers (40–41) by pointing out the numerous ways in which Lucan blurs the seemingly clear boundaries between the two sides: "Things are confused even more by the undeniable fact that the Massilians are themselves a paradigm of Rome; and like Rome, Massilia is founded by exiles from the East (339–42), their *fides* recalling the *pietas* of Aeneas. Since Rome was founded by exiles from Troy, is the Massilian campaign a replay of the Trojan war, Trojans versus Greeks? Or does the east-versus-west theme recall the battle of Salamis? Things are so confused that you do not know if the man you strike is Greek, Trojan, Persian or Roman. From this mass of undirected animosity we can deduce at least one thing: the Romans are destroying themselves: both sides are represented on both sides."

[31] Cf. Hunink (1992: 219) on this "striking paradox" of victory defeated by victory.

[32] Just as the bloodthirsty purges of Sulla ended with the poet's depiction of the sea stained red as the Tiber carried the dead downstream, so too in this battle the water is stained with blood and clogged with corpses:

> cruor altus in unda
> spumat, et obducti concreto sanguine fluctus.
> et, quas immissi traxerunt vincula ferri,
> has prohibent iungi conferta cadavera puppis. (3.572–575)

get ripped off (3.615), bodies are torn in two (3.642), and arms are cut off (3.669). While none of these death scenes directly result in beheading *per se*, they are scenes of dismemberment, and Lucan's use of *truncus* upholds its grim specter throughout the narrative—and looks ahead to the battle's closing scene when the *trunci* float ashore.

Before analyzing this closing scene, however, one death during the sea battle, the accidental suicide of Phoceus (3.696–704), merits closer attention as an exemplum of civil war's inherent drive towards defeat being the single outcome for all sides involved.[33] This particular death scene gives us the picture of shipwrecked soldiers who, though drowning themselves, still manage to drag their enemies down with them to die beneath the waves (3.693–696). Lucan states that they are happy to trade their lives for the certainty that in dying they have killed an enemy (*implicitis gaudent subsidere membris | mergentesque mori*, 3.695–696). At this point Lucan introduces Phoceus, the one man among them who is such a good swimmer that he can hold his breath long enough to drown his enemy and still return safely to the surface (3.696–700). In other words, being a *victor* over his enemies does not require his death. Yet, in typical Lucanian irony, this is precisely what his victory brings about:

> hic, ubi comprensum penitus deduxerat hostem,
> victor et incolumis summas remeabat in undas;
> sed, se per vacuos credit dum surgere fluctus,
> puppibus occurrit tandemque sub aequore mansit. (3.701–704)

> This one, when he had grappled an enemy and led him deep down, would return safely as a *victor*, swimming to the surface waves; however, while he thought he was rising through clear waters, he struck the hull and at last stayed underneath the surface.

[33] On this passage, see Hunink (1992: 250-2).

Phoceus, whom Lucan intentionally names a *victor*, thinks himself safe in his victory, but he cannot in the end save himself. Like the *victor* in the proem, Phoceus brought about his own defeat by means of the very act whereby he made himself *victor*.

After a string of such death scenes, the sea battle is brought to a remarkably abrupt close with the sudden declaration, *inclinant rem fata ducum, nec iam amplius anceps | belli casus erat* (3.752).[34] Lucan is historically bound to make the Caesarian forces the victors, but the naming of a winner at all with such an abrupt transition has a highly artificial quality. Up to this point, the entire battle narrative has depicted a chaotic free-for-all of civil war imagery and sequential death scenes in which no *victor* in the traditional epic sense could in fact be found.[35] Lucan, however, imposes one onto his narrative, calling the Romans *victores* (3.755).[36] If, however, this sea battle is to be read as part of the civil war—in which the *victor* is promised *nullos triumphos* (1.12)—then it remains to be asked what *spolium* the Romans can gain from such a victory. The last two lines of Book 3 seem to provide the answer: *at Brutus in aequore victor | primus Caesareis pelagi decus addidit armis* (3.761–762). Lucan caps the book by telling us that Brutus the *victor* was the first to add *decus*—glory and honor—to Caesar's military cause. For the first time in the epic, Lucan seems to set aside his programmatic subversion of victory and defeat and to restore epic convention in awarding the epic *victor* with his customary due of glory and honor. When we look back a few lines,

---

[34] Cf. Hunink (1992: 263).

[35] Cf. Masters's (1991: 41–2) incisive summary of Lucan's narrative: "Weight, congestion, splitting apart, broken fragments, suicide: these themes and many more are crushed into the sea-battle description. Every pattern of death imitates in some way Lucan's civil-war imagery…"

[36] Lucan names them *victores* in the context of explaining the fate of the Greek ships: *Graiae pars maxima classis | mergitur, ast aliae mutato remige puppes | victores vexere suos; navalia paucae | praecipiti tenuere fuga* (3.753–756).

however, to read what Lucan actually states the direct outcome of the battle was, we come to an entirely different conclusion.

Lucan's narrative qualifies the kind of victory actually won by the Romans with a final, parting scene of terrible grief and wrenching loss, a scene that vividly recreates the allusion from 2.186–190:[37]

> quis in urbe parentum
> fletus erat, quanti matrum per litora planctus!
> coniunx saepe sui confusis vultibus unda
> credidit ora viri Romanum amplexa cadaver,
> accensisque rogis miseri de corpore trunco
> certavere patres. (3.756–761)

> What tears the parents shed in the city, how much the mothers beat their breasts along the shore! Often a wife thought that the Roman corpse she's embracing—his facial features worn away by the sea—is that of her own husband, and while funeral pyres burn, miserable fathers fight over a hacked and mutilated body.

This may appear at first glance to be the traditional lament in epic of the defeated and thus not worthy of closer attention, but there are two factors at work here to indicate that this passage communicates more than merely a formulaic lament. First, Lucan rhetorically places this scene such that the reader focuses on it as the most visible result of the naval battle.[38] Lucan passes quickly over the Roman *victores* and instead draws our attention to the defeated party, emphasizing the loss of defeat and not the glory due the *victor* as the natural outcome of the conflict.

This becomes the inglorious *decus* (3.762) which *Brutus victor* wins for Caesar at Massilia. It can only be with great irony that Lucan seamlessly makes the transition from

---

[37] Aside from both passages sharing the same image, they also share some notable vocabulary: *truncus* (2.189, 3.760), *litora* (2.189, 3.757), *confundere* (2.191, 3.758).

[38] This focusing effect is aided by the effective use of direct audience address (*quis fletus…quanti planctus!*)

this last scene of grief and Roman death to his declaration that Caesar's side won *decus* as a result of the battle.[39] The victory is indeed won, but the glory for the *victor* is empty. It is not just that we see the Roman dead signaling the subversion of Roman victory but specifically that we see the shores littered with Roman *trunci*, an image that powerfully evokes the death of Priam:

> haec finis Priami fatorum, hic exitus illum
> sorte tulit Troiam incensam et prolapsa videntem
> Pergama, tot quondam populis terrisque superbum
> regnatorem Asiae. iacet ingens litore truncus,
> avulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus.
> (*Aeneid* 2.554–558)

> This was the end of Priam's fortunes, this the destruction that by chance took him—who was once the lofty ruler over so many peoples in the lands of Asia—and made him see Troy put to the flames and the Pergamene citadel collapsed in ruin. A great *truncus* lies upon the shore, its head plucked from its shoulders, a corpse without a name.

In Vergil, the ominous appearance of a *truncus* lying upon the shore signaled the destruction of the Trojan kingdom and the defeat of its people. In Lucan's epic about the civil war waged amongst the very descendants of Priam's Trojans, the poet brings us full circle. In this world of civil war, however, it is not Roman defeat but Roman victory that brings about the appearance of *trunci* lying upon the shore, both here after Massilia and most importantly after the beheading of Pompey upon the shores of Egypt. In all such

[39] Cf. Metger (1957: 76), who proposes just such an ironical reading. This is in contrast to Hunink (1992: 266) who believes that *decus* is not to be taken ironically: "The word may appear ironical to modern readers after the gruesome images of the preceding sections, but it is probably not intended to convey negative associations here…With *at*, the poet has created a simple contrast between the suffering of the Massilians and the victory of Brutus." I would tend to agree that its placement after a scene of suffering does not alone argue for an ironical reading, but this in combination with the passage's singular focus on Roman death and loss even in the face of its own victory produce a stronger argument for irony.

cases, Lucan is directly alluding to Vergil's image in which the destruction of the city and her people are at hand.[40]

The second thing that must be recognized in the closing scene of bodies washing ashore is the startling fact that the corpses (*trunci*) washing ashore are not Massilians but in fact Romans (*Romanum amplexa cadaver*). The Massilians are mourning and even fighting over the wrong *trunci*![41] Lucan thus presents us with the brutal irony of the *victi* conducting funerals for the *victores*. Even more significant, however, is the fact that the funerals fail as successful memorials. Since the dead cannot be properly recognized due to their disfigurement, their identities have been erased consigning them to *oblivio*.[42] The battle is supposed to be a victory for the Romans, but the last, enduring image Lucan leaves his readers with is that of *Roman* corpses; the bodies of the Massilians, who were supposed to have been routed and defeated, are nowhere to be seen. What the Romans gain by winning and the Massilians gain by losing is the same: both lose the ability to *memorialize* their dead.

Severed Heads and the Attack on Memory

Returning to the flashback narrative, we can see further scenes that illustrate this central difficulty of successful memorialization amidst the disruptive chaos of civil war. One example is the fact that Sulla's purges cause a burial problem, for his reign of terror

---

[40] Lucan has already stated this vision for Rome in the proem when he describes the second *spolium* of civil war (1.24–32) as nothing less than the devastation of Italy, her walls and structures collapsed into ruin, her people no more. Lines 1.24–26 in fact offer numerous verbal parallels to Vergil's description of the fall of Priam and Troy. Lucan offers us *Italiae* in place of Vergil's *Asiae*, *lapsis muris* for *prolapsa Pergama*, and most notably *ingentia saxa iacent* for *iacet ingens*.

[41] Hunink (1992; 264) in his commentary on these lines recognizes this point: "Mothers and fathers want to take care of corpses floating ashore, but they tragically do the wrong thing." He does not develop the significance of this failure of memory, however.

[42] Rowland (1969: 208) writes of this scene, "Roman corpses have now become Massilian corpses, and whether the headless body is Roman or Massilian is irrelevant…having lost its own identity, it assumes the identity of those on both sides."

creates so many refugees (and so many corpses of those who did not flee) that Lucan says the tombs outside the city were literally bursting with those who had fled for their lives, such that the bodies of the living were haphazardly mixed in with those who had already been buried (*busta replete fuga, permixtaque viva sepultis | corpora*, 2.152-3). In this way, civil war subverts the effective purpose of the tomb from that of a living memorial for the dead to the virtual residence and place of safety for the living.[43] Lucan calls our attention to a deeper problem only a few lines later when discussing those who choose to respond to the prospect of being murdered by committing suicide, for one of these actually lays down the material for his own funeral pyre and even leaps straight into the fires while still alive (*hic robora busti | exstruit ipse sui necdum omni sanguine fuso | desilit in flammas et, dum licet, occupat ignes*, 2.157-9). Not only does this action reflect the man's desire to control his own death, but more significantly it symbolizes the failure of communal memory. He must resort to building his own pyre and cremating himself because he realizes that he cannot count on anybody else to remember and memorialize him through the funeral rituals. The basic functions of the Roman *funus*—the memorialization of the dead and the resulting benefits to the surviving community—simply cannot operate in this world of civil war.

Lucan illustrates this central fact most vividly in the lines that immediately follow, as we witness the unspeakable cruelties and horrors inflicted specifically upon the bodies of Sulla's victims. The opening image is a sort of macabre still life: the severed heads of the city's leaders, fixed upon the tips of spears, have been carried from all

[43] Cf. Schmitt (1995: 66), "Die Passage entbehrt nicht der Ironie: Die Menschen müssen, um sich der Ermordung zu entziehen, dorthin fliehen, wo sie der Feind sehen will, nämlich in Gräber." He goes on to note the contrasting parallel with Erichtho in Book 6 who dwells amidst deserted graves (*desertaque busta | incolit et tumulos expulses obtinet umbris*, 6.511-2). See also Fantham (1992: 109).

corners of the city and gathered together in the Forum (*colla ducum pilo trepidam gestata per urbem | et medio congesta foro*, 2.160-1).[44] Not only is the severed head a symbol of victory, but it also is used here to highlight even further the inability to memorialize these dead.[45] The old man recounts how the families of the dead, driven by the memorializing impulse, sought to unite the headless corpses with the correct heads so the bodies could be recognizably whole again and thus be given a proper *funus*. As Lucan poignantly states, *cognoscitur illic | quidquid ubique iacet* (2.161-2)—what lay everywhere else could be recognized only by the heads arrayed in the Forum. Such a scavenger hunt would be difficult enough by itself, but we discover that another, deeper problem faces those who would hold funerals for the dead. Just as will be the case in the aftermath of the Massilian sea battle, these heads have begun to rot and decay to the point that they have lost their recognizable features (*cum iam tabe fluunt confusaque tempore multo | amisere notas*, 2.166-7). Nevertheless, the heads are still snatched up one by one by desperate family members grasping at any hope to reconstitute the deceased's body and grant them some semblance of a *funus*. Whether anybody retrieved the correct head belonging to their loved one is a question left unanswered, and the implication is that the

[44] The leaders' severed heads gather in the Forum in death just as they would have in life; Fantham (1992: 110) points out the irony (as well as the aptness) of the Forum as the place for display: "the heads are taken to the forum, and the centre of political life becomes that of political death." A further ironic connection lies in the fact that one component of the *funus* for important Romans was the display of the body in the Forum or other suitably public place (cf. Polybius 6.53.1). Thus we see another subversion of the traditional practices of the Roman *funus*.

[45] On this section, see Fantham (1992: 110-2), who writes, "In this whole narrative the severed head (cf. 113, 150, 160-6) and anonymity of the headless bodies are symbols of inhumanity" (110). I contend that they also are symbols of the power of civil war both to subvert traditional symbols of victory and to frustrate attempts at establishing memorials for the dead that preserve the memory for future generations.

miseri parentes, confused by the rotted facial features, in fact gathered up the wrong ones.[46]

The speaker draws our attention to this point in the story and renders its emotions all the more powerful by personalizing it as his own experience:[47]

> meque ipsum memini…caesi deformia fratris
> ora rogo cupidum vetitisque imponere flammis,
> omnia Sullanae lustrasse cadavera pacis
> perque omnis truncos, cum qua cervice recisum
> conveniat, quaesisse, caput. (2.169–173)

> …and I remember how I myself…yearning to place the deformed features of my slain brother upon the funeral pyre, upon the flames denied to him, reviewed all the ranks of the corpses of Sulla's peace and searched through all the headless corpses for that one whose neck would fit his severed head.

It is important to note what the elderly speaker recalls as his central motivation: he desired to give his brother over to the flames of a proper funeral pyre—flames that the speaker specifically states were denied by Sulla and by the power of civil war. Once again Lucan depicts the tension surrounding the desire to execute *funera* for the dead and the inability to do so. Here too it is left to the audience to speculate whether the speaker was successful or not, but there is no reason given here to suppose an affirmative answer. These dead are condemned to *oblivio*, rendering them truly dead. This scene looks directly ahead to the almost identical situation at the end of Book 3 when the disfigured *trunci* of Roman dead wash ashore after the naval battle off Massilia. Unable to recognize the bodies with no features to aid their memory, the mourning locals

---

[46] Cf. Schmitt (1995: 69). He goes on to note the parallel between these unidentified bodies and the beheaded body of Pompey in Book 8 who also has no distinguishing features left (*nulla manente figura | una nota est Magno capitis iactura revulsi*, 8.710-1); yet in contrast, for Pompey it is *precisely* the lack of his head that will confirm his identity, since his headless corpse will define Caesar's victory and ironically invert the pattern for the rest of the epic.

[47] Cf. Tasler (1972: 243) who notes that this personalized memory "belebt diesen Teil der Rede."

mistakenly took them for their own Massilian dead. Like the heads that were *confusa tempore multo* (2.166) in the Forum, these faces are also rendered unrecognizable (*confusis vultibus*, 3.758), and still the equally *miseri parentes* (2.167; 3.760-1) fought with each other over who would get the privilege of placing a *truncus* upon the lit funeral pyres (*accensisque rogis*, 3.760).[48]

The speaker's personal experience of trying to match the head with body leads straight into the account of the torture of Marius Gratidianus (2.174-93), a death scene that also confirms the central importance of recognizing the deceased and the losses that result when recognition is rendered impossible. After describing how Marius's hands were wrenched off, the speaker draws our particular attention to those tortures suffered by the victim's head while still alive: in succession, the torturers rip out his tongue, lop off his ears, cut off his nose, and finally gouge out and skewer his eyeballs which watched all the previous atrocities (*spectatis lumina membris*, 2.185)! After sustaining so much punishment, his head looked significantly just like "*trunci* that wash ashore after perishing in the middle of the ocean" (*nec magis informes veniunt ad litora trunci | qui medio periere freto*, 2.189-90).[49] As seen above, such bodies cannot be recognized and thus remembered. It is no surprise then that at this point the speaker forcefully asks:

> quid perdere fructum
> iuvit et, ut vilem, Marii confundere vultum?
> ut scelus hoc Sullae caedesque ostensa placeret
> agnoscendus erat. (2.190–3)

[48] Cf. Narducci (2002: 122) who writes that this passage presents "alcune delle scene più raccapriccianti del poema, prima di trovare un più ampio sviluppo nel lamento sul cadavere di Pompeo."

[49] Cf. Quint (1993: 143-4) who highlights this passage as an example of horror with which the reader is meant to interact at a visceral level: "the poet wants to rub the noses of his readers in the gory facts of civil war, to violate a Virgilian decorum that, for all the bloody descriptions of battle in the Aeneid, now seems, in contrast, to have aestheticized war and politics" (143).

> What good did it do to lose their reward and, as if it were some cheap thing, leave the face of Marius unrecognizable? In order for this crime, this spectacle of slaughter, to be pleasing to Sulla, *the face had to be recognizable*!

Lucan's elderly speaker emphasizes this theme on numerous occasions because it sheds light on that central tension surrounding the desire for the survivors of the dead to memorialize them through funeral rites and ceremonies. Without recognition, there can be no memory. Beheading, a key symbol of civil war in the epic, actively separates the recognizable features of the head—the *loci memoriae*—from the rest of the body, which in turn makes the act of remembering much more difficult. In short, these scenes of frustrated *funera* in the midst of the people's defeat reveal that civil war actively subverts attempts to remember—and if the dead cannot be remembered, then they are truly dead.

Lucan's epic reveals that civil war actively subverts attempts to remember and memorialize. Repeatedly throughout this section, the past has been ignored, *pietas* has been abandoned, and attempts to conduct *funera* have been frustrated. Along with these, *virtus* also must be left behind. The dire situation Lucan is describing essentially corresponds in poetic form to what Cicero lamented at *De Republica* 5.1.2. This present age, Cicero writes, inherited the *Respublica* from our ancestors, but its colors, as if it were a painting, were already beginning to fade with age (*sed iam evanescentem vetustate*). Just as Polybius noted how it was the role of the *imagines* and the funeral speeches to continually make anew the *fama* of our past, Cicero sees how it fell to his generation to refreshen (*renovare*) the picture of the *Respublica*, a task in which he ruefully admits they failed:

> quid enim manet ex 'antiquis moribus,' quibus ille dixit 'rem stare Romanam'? quos ita oblivione obsoletos videmus, ut non modo non colantur, sed iam ignorentur. (*De Republica* 5.1.2)

> For what is now left of the 'ancient customs' upon which he [Ennius] said that the 'Res Romana firmly stood'? We see that that they have so completely faded into *oblivio* that not only are they no longer practiced, but they are already unknown.

What Lucan vividly recreates in his epic is that moment in Roman history when this very crisis between *memoria* and *oblivio* hangs in the balance.

And yet it must be pointed out that this long play of memory back to the times of Marius and Sulla show that the people of Rome do remember *something*. As discussed earlier, the line that introduces the flashback explicitly sets up the whole speech as a series of *exempla* (*atque aliquis mango quaerens exempla timori*, 2.67). Note, however, what Lucan tells us the *exempla* recalls. These are not memories of *virtus* that will inspire those who hear them to pursue their own deeds of similar *virtus*, such as the *exempla* Cicero and others know are so foundational to the health of *Roma*. These are rather memories of "great fear." The closing lines of the flashback—indeed of the entire description of the people's reaction to defeat—reveals the effects these fearful *exempla* have upon those who hear them: *sic maesta senectus | praeteritique memor flebat metuensque futuri* (2.232-3). In short, they work just like *exempla* are supposed to work, except that instead of inspiring the desire to become more virtuous, the old man's "examples for great fear" naturally inspire greater fear (*metuensque futuri*). To quote Gowing:

> "…*this* memory is a particularly valuable one, for it arms people with the knowledge of what will happen when a civil war occurs. Of course it proves to be an ineffectual memory, for the people who most need to hear and heed it, don't…And there's the rub: memory can lead to wise choices, but only if we listen to the people who are telling us the right memory."[50]

[50] Gowing (2005: 86); cf. also Henderson (1998: 181).

In a subtle but cutting ironic twist, Lucan at last offers a picture of people who do remember the past (*praeteritique memor*), but theirs is only a selective picture of the past, one that assaults *pietas* and memorializes forgetting. In the final analysis, the people's fear-driven response has come full circle to this outcome: *more fear*.

What the Roman people face in Lucan's epic is the death of Rome. Whether it is remembered or not will determine the real meaning of Rome's defeat. If the people can remember her and memorialize her, despite her defeat in civil war, then she can continue to have life in a very real sense. If she is remembered, then she will continue to influence those who live on after her. Death and defeat does not have to be the end. The alternative, on the other hand, is *oblivio* and lasting death. For Rome, and for everything she represents to Lucan's readers, memory is truly a matter of life and death.[51] As the narrative episodes preceding Cato's entry into the epic illustrate, civil war possesses an inherently subversive and destructive power over Rome. The possibility of victory has been defeated, and memory too has failed.

Civil war has trapped everybody involved within this self-destructive cycle. Indeed, this flashback memory, which was introduced as an *exemplum iterum bellis civilibus* (2.64), conveys the frightening impression that the Romans are caught in a loop of civil wars, one following another up to the present time and likely continuing into the future.[52] The speaker concludes his memory narrative by predicting that this is exactly

---

[51] Gowing (2005: 12-3) points out the link that exists between forgetting and death: "In other words, behind the link between *historia* and *memoria*…lie some related notions about the connection between the living and the dead in Roman thought. This is an important nuance to grasp, for it explains much about the anxiety imperial Romans felt over the "demise" of the Republic and its memory."

[52] Narducci (2002: 116-26) analyzes the flashback as a memory of the past that explicitly creates disruptive anxiety of the future; he concludes, "Cesare e Pompeo costituiscono per Roma, e per l'intero genere umano, un pericolo incomparabilmente più grave di quello a suo tempo rappresentato da Mario e da Silla." Cf. also Schmitt (1995: 41-2) and Casamento (2005: 61-2).

what they will suffer through again (*haec rursus patienda manent, hoc ordine belli | ibitur*, 2.223-4); the prophecy of the matron at the close of Book 1 also confirms this very fear when she proclaims that the coming civil war will be followed by Caesar's assassination which will be followed by another civil war (1.678-95). Masters recognizes this undercurrent in Lucan toward "limitlessness" and the lack of resolution and asserts:

> For the civil war can have no ending. Everything about the war and the poem is boundless, illimitable, infinite. Caesar's ambition, *nil actum credens cum quid superesset agendum*; Pompey's tomb, which spatially confines him to a few feet of earth, but by a trick of rhetoric expands over the whole world; the enormity of the *nefas* in which the whole universe participates; the grotesque repetitiveness of the series of civil wars which go on and on over the same ground *ad nauseam*. To treat all of this in its entirety – in any case an impossible task – to gather everything into the form of completeness, would be to contain and limit what must, in Lucan's terms, be uncontainable.[53]

In this view, recognizing that the epic offers no way out *is the point*. I agree that this undercurrent is one that runs through the epic, and if we were to stop our reading here our vision of Lucan's poem would be bleak indeed.

But as the following chapters on Cato will reveal, this is *not* the end of Lucan's story. This and the preceding chapters (2-4) have explored the paradigms of defeat—specifically the assault on the proper functioning of memory—that Cato must face and seek to overcome when he enters the poem immediately following the flashback's conclusion. As we shall see, Cato will offer a different paradigm in which memory has the power to be victorious.

---

[53] Masters (1991: 251).

CHAPTER 5
THE DANGERS OF PARTICIPATION: BRUTUS'S SPEECH (2.234-284)

Brutus and Cato Introduced (2.234–241)

The sudden appearance of Brutus at 2.234 when he knocks on Cato's door in the middle of the night marks a total change from the atmosphere that has pervaded the epic since the latter part of Book 1. This is, as we shall see, the point at which Lucan begins to show us at least a glimpse of what will stand in opposition to the failure of the future, represented by the portents (1.522-695) and the corruption of memory represented by the civil war models of Marius and Sulla. Lucan has portrayed the condition of Rome up to this point as a self-defeat (*naufragium sibi quisque facit*, 1.503) that is guided by the Romans' own fear, and he reinforces this image in the final two lines of the section with words like *maesta senectus, flebat,* and *metuens futuri* (2.232-3). Brutus is not developed as a character in Lucan's epic as we have it, though it is conceivable Lucan could have intended to reintroduce him in Book 10 or following just as he reintroduced Lucan again only in Book 9. Because of this lack of character development, we are left with a Brutus who is important not for his own sake but rather for the sake of introducing Cato by posing the very questions and problems that Lucan wants his Cato to address.[1]

The first two words immediately following the fear-inducing memory of Marius and Sulla are *at non* (2.234). These are striking words, for they signal that Lucan is moving us to a different setting and atmosphere altogether, one that is decidedly *not* like

[1] Cf. Radicke (2004: 208) who concludes that "Die Figur des Brutus wird nur als ein Gesprächspartner eingeführt, um die richtigen Fragen zu stellen." See also Ahl (1976: 237).

what has gone before and yet in some way linked to it narratologically.[2] This shift thus sets the tone for this new episode in which Brutus and Cato both appear as active characters in the story for the first time.[3] The opening lines of this new episode can be organized as follow:[4]

1. (234-238) Brutus introduced
2. (238-241) Cato introduced

> at non magnanimi percussit pectora Bruti
> terror et in tanta pavidi formidine motus
> pars populi lugentis erat, sed nocte sopora,
> Parrhasis obliquos Helice cum verteret axes,
> atria cognati pulsat non ampla Catonis.
> invenit insomni volventem publica cura
> fata virum casusque urbis cunctisque timentem
> securumque sui, farique his vocibus orsus: (2.234-241)

> (But terror did not strike the heart of great-souled Brutus, nor was he a part of the panic-stricken people in mourning, disturbed by such great dread—but he, in the sleep of night, when Parrhasian Helike bends toward the horizon, knocks upon the modest front door of his relative Cato. *Him* he finds wide awake, pondering with never-resting care the concerns of the state, the dooms of men, and the destruction of the City, fearing for all others yet at peace regarding himself; and so he began his speech with these words:)

The passage introduces both Brutus and Cato, but it does so one at a time and in roughly equal proportion. We first see Brutus, literally emerging out of the fearful chaos

---

[2] Cf. Fantham (1992: 123) who cites some other examples of *at non* in Latin epic.

[3] Many scholars have examined this speech, though it usually given significantly less attention than the Cato speech even though both speeches form a coherent whole and are best examined together. Studies include Brisset (1964: 148-50), Lebek (1976: 178-81), Ahl (1976: 234-9), Croisille (1982: 75-82), George (1991: 246-52), Rudich (1997: 119-21), De Nadaï (2000: 274-82), Narducci (2002: 370-83), Sklenář (2003: 61-6), Radicke (2004: 208-9). To my knowledge, however, there has hitherto been no systematic analysis via close reading of each section of the speech.

[4] In this and the following chapter, I have provided at the front of each narrative section heading a detailed outline of the verses covered in that section. These outlines shed light not only on the section's thematic contents—specifically the arguments used in each speech—but also on their rhetorical structuring. Lebek (1976: 179) offers a schematic outline that shares some similarity with my own but some differences as well.

of the preceding sections. In direct contrast to the *populus lugens* of Rome, Lucan tells us that Brutus is not caught up (*percussit, motus*) in all the *terror* and *formido* of the situation. He is in fact not frightened at all but instead *magnanimus*.[5] Furthermore, he is shown seeking out the home of his kinsman (*atria cognati…Catonis*, 2.238) in a spirit of cooperative support, a clear departure from the *cognatasque acies* of the proem (1.4) and the flashback's depiction of kinsmen seeking each other for the sake of murder and beheading (e.g. 2.148-151).[6] The setting itself mirrors the calmness of the two men, for Lucan tells us that Brutus seeks out Cato "in the sleep of the night" (*sed nocte sopora*), and Cato for his part is also undisturbed by the surrounding chaos, concerned as he is for others but unconcerned for his own self (*cunctisque timentem securumque sui*).[7]

This scene—a consultation with a wise man for the purpose of asking a question about the future—follows a model already established from the preceding narrative (1.469-2.233). The advance of Caesar's army coupled with the onset of numerous frightening portents (1.522-583) led the people to seek an answer to that most basic question: what does the future hold? Accordingly they consult with the Etruscan haruspex Arruns (1.584-638), followed by a consultation with the astrologer Figulus

---

[5] Cf. Fantham (1992: 123) who notes that *magnanimus* is a standard word applied to hero-figures. Lucan, for example, quite often refers to Pompey by simply naming him *Magnus*.

[6] Narducci (1979: 130ff) notes the similarities between this scene in which Brutus seeks out Cato and *Iliad* Book 6 when Hector seeks out Paris; Lausberg (1985: 1598) further points out how both scenes deal heavily with the question of participation in the battle: "daß es um die Frage der Beteiligung am Kampf geht."

[7] The adversative *sed*, confirming the initial *at*, reinforces the contrast we are to see between this and the preceding episodes. Cf. Seneca *Ep*. 95.69 where he describes Cato as the one who remained *inpavidus* amidst the general upheavals of civil war. See also Fantham (1992: 125). It is unexpected at first glance to find Cato, whom the tradition saw as the one who came nearest to the model of the Stoic *sapiens*, described by Lucan here as *timentem*, for the good Stoic was to be free of all *patheiai* such as fear. I will confront the issue of Stoic emotions more fully in the following chapter on Cato, where I will discuss the difference between harmful assents to false impressions (*patheiai*) and rational assents to true impressions (*eupatheiai*). This distinction will be crucial for an accurate reading of Lucan's portrayal of Cato.

(1.639-672). The sequence closes with the shocking appearance of a frenzied matron shouting prophecies (1.673-695). The terrified people want answers and a glimmer of hope in their situation that perhaps their defeat in civil war may yet be averted, and all three figures come forward to meet this demand for answers. Yet their predictions, each more detailed than the last, offer no hope to the people of Rome: *bellum civile* is assured and is closing in. In a similar fashion, Brutus seeks out Cato much as one would a *vates* in order to consult him about the future.[8] As we shall see in more detail below, however, the nature of Brutus's question is significantly different.

Brutus's Speech (2.242-284)

The speech of Brutus can be broken down into the following outline:

1. (242-247) Cato as *Exemplum*
2. (247-284) Question of Cato's potential involvement in the Civil War
    a. (247-250) Brutus's initial statement of choices
        i. (247-248) Stay aloof and guard peace
        ii. (249-250) Choose a side and favor crime
    b. (251-259) Reasons why different people get involved
        i. (251-255) Others are led to civil war by personal reasons
        ii. (255-259) Cato's involvement would mean he chooses civil war for its own sake
    c. (260-281) Cato should avoid any involvement
        i. (260-273) Involvement discussed in general terms
            i-a. (260-266) Warning of the dangers posed to Cato's *virtus* by involvement
            i-b. (266-273) The tranquil rewards of staying aloof
        ii. (273-281) Involvement discussed specifically in political terms
            ii-a. (273-277) Caesar will benefit from Cato's involvement
            ii-b. (277-281) Involvement will thus mean a loss of libertas
    d. (281-284) A New Option: Cato can involve himself to fight for *leges* and *libertas*

Cato as Exemplum (242-247)

omnibus expulsae terris olimque fugatae
virtutis iam sola fides, quam turbine nullo

[8] Cf. George (1991: 248) who sees Brutus's visitation in the model of one consulting an oracle.

> excutiet Fortuna tibi, tu mente labantem
> derige me, dubium certo tu robore firma.
> namque alii Magnum vel Caesaris arma sequantur,
> dux Bruto Cato solus erit.

> ("You—now the only trustworthy refuge of a *virtus* that has for some time been expelled from all lands and put to flight, a refuge which no storm of Fortune can shake apart—guide me straight though my mind wavers, strengthen me with your certain resolve though I harbor doubt. For indeed, let others follow Magnus or the arms of Caesar; the only leader for Brutus will be Cato.)

The speech opens with Brutus explaining the nature of his relationship to Cato. He first declares Cato to be the *sola fides virtutis* in a world in which *virtus* appears to have long been driven out elsewhere.[9] The real significance of Cato's *virtus* here lies in the role that it will play in influencing Brutus's life. When he begs from Cato, "*derige me labantem, firma dubium*," he looks to Cato as someone who will point him toward right action and away from harmful action; this image mirrors the power that the *exemplum* also has in Roman thought. As we have seen, Livy's preface describes history as a *monumentum* that is *salubre ac frugiferum* insomuch as it is full of every kind of *exemplum* from which you can see what should be imitated (*quod imitere*) and what

[9] This is reminiscent of Seneca *De Tranq*. 16.1 where Seneca refers to him as *Cato ille, virtutium viva imago*. This is the first of a long series of similarities between the words of Brutus in this speech and the writings of Seneca. The parallels in thought are frequent enough to suggest that Lucan is casting his Brutus in a particularly "Senecan" role as a would-be advisor whose advice highlights a strong Stoic position on the crucial question of Cato's involvement in the coming conflict. This "Senecan" voice of Brutus has been noted by others, notably Narducci (2002: 375-83) who discusses numerous passages from Seneca that influence Brutus's speech, and Salemme (2002: 10) who writes that Brutus in this speech "attualizza (e rende drammatica) l'astratta casistica senechiana…" Cf. also Rudich (1997: 120). As we will see in the following chapter, Cato rejects certain Stoic views espoused by Brutus (and resembling Seneca) as part of his argument for why he must become involved. Moreschini (2005: 132-6) provides an excellent synthesis of Stoic influence upon the *Bellum Civile*; he builds upon key studies by Friedrich (1938), Marti (1945), Dick (1967), Schotes (1969), Billerbeck (1985), and George (1991). This focus in the speech upon Stoic virtues in the abstract is part of what Sklenář (2003: 63) calls Brutus's efforts "to subordinate the Roman to the Stoic," where the "Roman" is the Cato who in the subsequent speech will align himself with a dying Rome more than with tenets of Stoic doctrine.

should be avoided (*quod vites*).[10] By describing Cato as a figure who models *virtus* and can help point others toward it, Brutus depicts Cato as his living *exemplum*.[11]

A useful epic parallel to this portrayal of Cato can be found in a speech of Aeneas made near the end of Vergil's epic. In *Aeneid* 12, just after Aeneas is cured of his arrow wound, he takes up his arms once again to renew the fight, pausing long enough to speak to his son Ascanius the last words that pass between father and son in the epic:

> disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem,
> fortunam ex aliis. nunc te mea dextera bello
> defensum dabit et magna inter praemia ducet.
> tu facito, mox cum matura adoleverit aetas,
> sis memor et te animo repetentem exempla tuorum
> et pater Aeneas et avunculus excitet Hector. (*Aeneid* 12.432-40)

> "Learn, child, *virtus* and true labor from me, but learn the ways of Fortune from others. Now my right hand will grant you a shield in war and will guide you through to great rewards. You make sure, when your years have one day soon grown to maturity, that you *remember*, and may your father Aeneas and your uncle Hector stir you on as you recall in your heart the *exempla* of your ancestors."

Aeneas, on the verge of entering the battle, offers himself to young Ascanius as a model for *virtus* and *verus labor*, much as Cato stands in Brutus's eyes as a model for *virtus* and *fides*. Furthermore, just as Aeneas adds that his son should not look to him for a life dependent upon *Fortuna*, Cato's *virtus* and *fides* is such that "no whirlwind of Fortune will shake" them apart (*quam turbine nullo excutiet Fortuna tibi*).[12] The greatest

---

[10] Livy, *Pr*. 10: *Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu, quod vites.*

[11] It is precisely as an *exemplum* that Seneca employs Cato in his works (a few examples include *De Ira* 2.32.2, *De Vita Beata* 21.3, *Ep*. 11.10), but of course it must be admitted that by the time of Nero, Cato as a figure of memory hardly existed anywhere *but* in the Roman *exempla* tradition. Accordingly, the depiction of Cato as an *exemplum* for living is hardly unique to Seneca as it began as early as Cicero, but it nonetheless reflects a view consistent with Seneca's writings.

[12] Cf. the similar sentiments of Seneca at *Ep*. 104.28.

connection, however, lies in Aeneas's final exhortation which explicitly casts himself as an *exemplum*: *sis memor et te animo repetentem exempla tuorum et pater Aeneas et avunculus excitet Hector*. Brutus's words evoke this Vergilian passage and invite the reader to see the qualities of Aeneas present in the figure of Cato as well, a connection that reinforces the image of Cato as *exemplum* both in life and in death.

Brutus next describes the political situation and shows how Cato— in his perception— should fit within it. "Let others," he exclaims, "follow the camps of Pompey or Caesar—the only leader for Brutus shall be Cato!" (*namque alii Magnum vel Caesaris arma sequantur dux Bruto Cato solus erit*) Brutus declares Cato to be not only his *exemplum*, but also his one and only leader. Such a declaration firmly places Cato as a distinct third figure in the epic with his own position and set of goals separate from Caesar and Pompey.[13] Cato may have historically fought on the side of Pompey, but in this epic Brutus depicts Cato involved in the war not as a true participant of either faction but instead as the standard-bearer for a different cause altogether that has nothing to do with helping decide the military conflict.[14]

---

[13] We find this view clearly set forth in Seneca who, while discussing constancy amidst adverse fortune, turns to the example set by Cato who stood alone for liberty and the Republic: *Denique in illa rei publicae trepidatione, cum illinc Caesar esset decem legionibus pugnacissimis subnixus, totis exterarum gentium praesidiis, hinc Cn. Pompeius, satis unus adversus omnia, cum alii ad Caesarem inclinarent, alii ad Pompeium, solus Cato fecit aliquas et rei publicae partes* (*Ep*. 104.30). Ahl (1976: 235) notes that Brutus's lofty vision of Cato in this section "distinguishes Cato not only from the crowd but from Brutus, setting him apart from even the most courageous men."

[14] Also cf. Seneca *Ep*. 14.12, 25.6. The difficulty in assessing Cato's exact relationship with Pompey over the course of the civil war is evident in Seneca who first declares that Cato followed Pompey (*De Constantia* 20.6) and then later writes that Cato became an opponent of both Pompey and Caesar (*Ep*. 95.70).

Question of Cato's Potential Involvement in the Civil War (247-284)

Brutus's initial statement of choices (247-250)
(247-248) Stay aloof and guard peace
(249-250) Choose a side and favor crime

pacemne tueris
inconcussa tenens dubio vestigia mundo,
an placuit ducibus scelerum populique furentis
cladibus immixtum civile absolvere bellum? (2.247-250)

> Are you watching over peace, holding onto the final traces of what remains unshaken in a shaken world, or are you delighted to be mixed up with criminal leaders and the disasters of a raging people and thus treat civil war as if it caused no guilt?

After outlining the nature of Cato's relationship to himself—and thereby suggesting how we are to read Cato's role within the epic—Brutus begins what is essentially a rhetorical *suasoria* on the question that dominates the rest of his speech: should Cato become involved in the civil war or remain disengaged?[15] Brutus lays out two possible courses of action: 1) to stay aloof from the struggle, 2) to enter the fray alongside everyone else hopelessly caught up in civil war. He then proceeds to list the perceived consequences of each: the first path is characterized by peace and tranquility amidst the surrounding chaos, whereas the second path is characterized by *crimina*, *clades*, and a people described as *furens*. Brutus's rhetoric makes it clear that non-involvement is intended as the proper choice. The dramatic hinge of this speech, however, lies in the fact that we as Lucan's readers already know that Cato *does* get involved. What then is it that leads Cato to action? Lucan sets the parameters for Cato's decision-making process through Brutus's initial view of the options open to him.

[15] Lebek (1976: 180) states the issue concisely: "Die prinzipiell gleiche Verwerflichkeit der zwei Gegner erst begründet das Problem, um das die Ansprache des Brutus nicht minder als die Antwort Catos kreist: Wie sollen die zwei edlen Römer sich verhalten in einem Bürgerkrieg, in dem die beiden gegnerischen Feldherrn *duces scelerum* (2,249) sind – genauer: wie soll Cato sich verhalten?" On reading the speech rhetorically as *suasoria*, see Brisset (1964: 148), Narducci (2002: 370).

The question of Cato's involvement is one of central importance, for the reason that the nature of his involvement—his motives and subsequent actions—must ultimately guide any attempt to understand his meaning in Lucan's story. This is as true for us today as it would have been for those under the Principate who also attempted to understand Lucan's Cato. It was an active question during Lucan's time, as witnessed in Seneca who sets forth vividly the issues at stake:

> Potest aliquis disputare an illo tempore capessenda fuerit sapienti res publica. "Quid tibi vis, Marce Cato? Iam non agitur de libertate; olim pessumdata est. Quaeritur, utrum Caesar an Pompeius possideat rem publicam; quid tibi cum ista contentione? Nullae partes tuae sunt; dominus eligitur. Quid tua, uter vincat? Potest melior vincere, non potest non peior esse, qui vicerit." Ultimas partes attigi Catonis. Sed ne priores quidem anni fuerunt qui sapientem in illam rapinam rei publicae admitterent; quid aliud quam vociferatus est Cato et misit irritas voces…? (*Ep*. 14.13)
>
> Someone can surely call into question whether a wise man will have felt obligated to engage in the political affairs of the Republic at *that time*: "What do you see in it for yourself, Marcus Cato? The status of *libertas* is no longer an issue—*that* has long since sunk to ruin. The question at issue now is whether Caesar or Pompey will control the Republic. What place is there for you in that kind of contest? You have no share in this business; a *dominus* is in the process of being chosen. What does it matter to you which one is *victor*? As for the one who wins, the better man can be *victor*, but in so doing he can't help but be the worse man." I have touched upon Cato's ultimate role. But not even in years past could the wise man act against that pillaging of the Republic. What else could Cato do than shout out and send forth his voice in vain…?

At issue here are the competing images of Cato that the tradition had passed down during the Principate and which Lucan sees a need to address. Many, such as Seneca's imagined interlocutor, rightly saw a potential difficulty in considering Cato Uticensis both as the Stoic *sapiens* known primarily for his *tranquilitas animi* and *constantia* as well as the politician who historically engaged himself in the disruptive chaos of the Roman civil

war.[16] When approaching Lucan's Cato, it is worth asking along with Seneca what Cato could hope to achieve by fighting in such a hopeless cause, when *libertas* was already doomed. Seneca, despite his promises to the contrary (*sed postea videbimus, an sapienti opera rei publicae danda sit, interim… Ep*. 14.14), never really offers an answer.[17]

Brutus has also posed this dilemma of involvement with its two options: to remain disengaged from the struggle or to engage in the struggle. The former, he argues, will assure a tranquil spirit (*tenens inconcussa vestigia*) whereas the latter will only bring disaster (*cladibus*) and the chaotic company of the wicked and emotionally disturbed (*ducibus scelerum populique furentis*). This rather one-sided argument rests upon the preservation of *virtus* in the face of the many threats posed to it by civil war. Having already established at the opening of his speech that Cato is set apart from his peers by his unassailable *virtus*, he poses these two options in such a way that it is obvious that only the choice of disengagement can preserve that *virtus* which makes Cato an *exemplum* in the first place. For Brutus, disengagement thus is the only way that Cato can preserve his role as a vehicle for memory.

He supports this choice through the use of *inconcutere*, part of the standard Stoic vocabulary of *apatheia*, that is the detachment of the wise man from his surroundings.[18]

---

[16] Rudich (1997: 119) notes that the tranquil version of Cato doesn't fit with the politically-engaged Cato that emerges in his Book 2 speech who declares that he will fight for *Roma* and *Libertas*: "By this emphasis on his political commitment and political activities Lucan's Cato contrasts with the more convenient and innocuous image of him created by the joint efforts of both pro-Imperial and anti-Imperial authors as found, for instance, in Seneca – not of a Republicanist leader, but of a Stoic sage whose main achievement is defiance of death, not of Caesar." I expand this view of Cato's goals by adding his focus on memorializing Rome, an act which requires his engagement in the state's political downfall. Cf. also the discussions of Lebek (1976: 180-1), Bartsch (1997: 121), and Narducci (2002: 377ff) on this point.

[17]In contrast to Seneca and almost everyone else, however, Lucan *will* tackle these questions directly in Cato's speech. Cf. Ahl (1976: 236).

[18] It was a Stoic goal to be free from negative emotions—false assents that produced desire, pleasure, fear, or dejection—and this state of freedom from the above emotions was known as *apatheia*. See Rist (1978:

By holding on to the undisturbed remnants (*inconcussa vestigia*) in a world tilting towards chaos, Cato can maintain peace. It is important to note that in this context, *pacem* must refer specifically to *his own* personal, internal peace, for civil war has already driven away all hope of peace in the larger, political sense. Chief on Brutus's mind is the preservation of the *imago* of Cato, *vir virtutis*, that he has erected for himself. A Cato with damaged *virtus* is unthinkable, for Cato cannot be both morally compromised and an *exemplum virtutis* at the same time.

The second chief element to Brutus's rhetorical argument here is Brutus's assumption that Cato's decision to engage in the conflict will surely be a sign that Cato "absolves" the civil war (*civile absolvere bellum*). Some have taken *absolvere* to mean that if Cato joins the conflict, then his lofty, unassailable status as a Stoic *sapiens* will genuinely legitimize the civil war, thus "absolving" it from being a *crimen*.[19] I do not, however, think that such a literal interpretation is required. Given his clear opinion of whom Cato would have to associate with—criminal rulers and a people gone mad with *furor*—surely Brutus cannot think that even Cato *could* literally absolve *bellum civile* from its *nefas*. Taken in such a light, Brutus is instead suggesting more generally that any involvement on Cato's part would have to mean that Cato didn't think civil war was a *crimen* or caused guilt. In other words, the act of "absolving" would be internal to

---

259ff) and Brennan (2005: 91-110) who offer excellent overviews of Stoic views on the emotions and *apatheia*; cf. also George (1991: 247-8). I discuss this further in Chapter 6 in connection with Cato himself. In the Latin Stoic writers, *concutere* and *inconcutere* appear frequently in the depiction of the wise man's *constantia* in the face of a crumbling world; cf. Fantham (1992: 126-7).

[19] For this view, see for example Fantham (1992: 247-50): "There is a contradiction between this first argument that Cato's participation will legitimate the war because of his status as wise man and patriot and the latter claim (256-9) that the evil of war will contaminate and devalue Cato." In order to see a contradiction here, Fantham must be arguing that Brutus literally means that Cato's involvement will render civil war morally acceptable; in this view, the implied objection from Brutus would be that civil war *should* remain a *crimen*. As I go on to dicuss, I do not think *absolvere* is being used in this strict, literal sense, and thus I see no contradiction between the two sections of Brutus's argument.

Cato's (incorrect thinking) and not in any way indicative of the reality of civil war. Brutus's argument is that if a virtuous *sapiens* like Cato were to join the fray, he would have to have abandoned his reason to join, since civil war clearly does and always will be a *crimen*. A true *sapiens* by definition cannot take leave of his reason, which is why Brutus focuses on the nature of civil war here. Cato's *virtus* must remain intact, he fees, or else the Cato he (and the later tradition) knows and desires to follow will cease to exist.

Reasons why different people get involved (251-259)
(251-255) Others are led to civil war by personal reasons
(255-259) Cato's involvement would mean he chooses civil war for its own sake

> quemque suae rapiunt scelerata in proelia causae:
> hos polluta domus legesque in pace timendae,
> hos ferro fugienda fames mundique ruinae
> permiscenda fides. nullum furor egit in arma;
> castra petunt magna victi mercede: tibi uni
> per se bella placent? quid tot durare per annos
> profuit immunem corrupti moribus aevi?
> hoc solum longae pretium virtutis habebis:
> accipiunt alios, facient te bella nocentem. (2.251–259)

> Personal causes thrust each person into criminal warfare: a stained family name and laws that must be respected during peacetime are the driving reasons for some, while starvation—whose only escape is the sword—and the uprooted *fides* of a wrecked world are the driving reasons for others. Blind fury by itself drives *nobody* to take up arms! They all seek out one camp or the other, already conquered by the promise of a great reward—would you alone enjoy warfare for its own sake? What good did it do you to stay steadfast through so many years, remaining immune to the immorality of a corrupt age? The only reward you will receive from your long years of *virtus* is this: civil wars accept others who are already guilty, but *you* they will *make* guilty.

Brutus continues to keep *virtus* as the central focus to his argument over why Cato should not enter the civil war by contrasting everybody else's motivations for fighting with those of a moral *exemplum* like Cato. Here Brutus picks up a common refrain in

literature against the moral downfall of Roman society, but such sentiments also connect well with the line of Stoic reasoning that since all others are non-sages, they are already marked by wicked desires and motives.[20] Yet while the urge to decry the moral failings of the age may be conventional, the specific causes that Brutus names are not randomly chosen. They in fact are continuations of the same themes we have already seen both in Lucan's proem and in the description of the reaction in Rome that precedes these speeches. The first pair of self-serving causes that Brutus names, a *domus polluta* and *leges in pace timendae*, match up closely with the proem's description of civil war as *cognata acies* (1.4) and as *ius datum sceleri* (1.2). Starvation is not mentioned in the proem, but Lucan links it to civil war in the proem when he lists *fames* among the disastrous events that are rendered "acceptable" so long as they led to Nero's rise to power.[21] And the final stated cause of *permiscenda fides* points back to the preceding narrative in which the fleeing people collectively abandoned their obligations of *fides* to father, spouse, and even the household gods (1.504-509), thus linking the loss of *memoria* itself as a cause of civil war.[22]

These stated motivations represent so well the very essence of civil war's subversive and self-destructive nature. The Cato that Brutus wants to see surely could

---

[20] The general moral failings of this or that generation was a well-worn topic by Lucan's time. Among the better known diatribes from the late Republic against public morality are those made by Cicero against Catiline and his followers (*Cat*. 2.17-23) and by Sallust against the lack of moral restraint in general at the end of the Republic (*BJ* 4.7-8 *et passim*). Lucan himself already decried the moral bankruptcy of the age as a leading cause of the civil war at 1.158-176, repeating many of the same themes here in Brutus's speech. On the inherent foolishness and wickedness of the non-sage in Stoic thought, see Brennan (2005: 36): "Well—none of us is perfect; perhaps that's not such a strange claim to make. But the Stoics made it stranger by insisting that every one of us is equally vice-ridden or vicious, equally far from virtue, equally sinful and unhappy."

[21] 1.41-5: *his, Caesar, Perusina fames Mutinaeque labores | accedant fatis…multum Roma tamen debet civilibus armis, | quod tibi res acta est.*

[22] Brutus's words here point to the cyclical feedback loop of memory's destructive relationship with civil war, in that memory can be both the result *and* the cause of civil war.

not share in these calculating, selfish motives. As his argument goes, Cato is a man of *virtus*, one who has already endured for so long and kept himself pure from the corruption of his age (*quid tot durare per annos profuit immunem corrupti moribus aevi?*). Accordingly, in contrast to everyone else, Cato could not possibly have any reason for participating in civil war—at least no reason that would be consistent with his *virtus*.[23] Brutus exaggeratedly concludes that Cato's only possible reason for participating would have to be that he alone enjoyed the idea of civil war for its own sake (*tibi uni per se bella placent?*). This would of course be unthinkable, and the dire consequences of following such a motive would be the self-destruction of Cato's status as moral *exemplum* since he would share in the guilt and *nefas* inherent to civil war (*hoc solum longae pretium virtutis habebis: accipiunt alios, facient te bella nocentem*). Standing on the proposition that civil war must by definition destroy the *virtus* of the participant, Brutus assumes that Cato could neither enter the war nor even desire to do so.

Brutus concludes that everybody else goes off to war *already conquered* by the vision of what they desire for themselves (*castra petunt magna victi mercede*). The critical word here is *victi*, a signal that Lucan is again working into this speech the victory/defeat theme that permeates his epic. This argument echoes the deeply subversive idea first expressed in the proem that to participate in civil war *is to be defeated already*. This line of reasoning surprisingly renders Pompey and even Caesar himself, the ultimate military *victor*, as participants who had the status of a defeated person before the conflict was decided at all. This seeming paradox clearly illustrates a crucial point concerning the special way in which Lucan treats the paired themes of

[23] Cf. Brisset (1964: 149), "De bas motifs d'intérêt personnel les guident seuls: ils vont participer à la guere civile, les uns pour éviter l'application des lois (v. 252), les autres poussés par la misère et pour échapper aux consequences de leur endettement (v. 253-254).".

victory and defeat. When Brutus talks about those seeking out camps being already defeated, he is not here using the word in its traditional sense of military victory or defeat. It had clearly not yet been determined which side would end up conquering and which would be defeated. Brutus is arguing—in a way that is consistent with what Lucan has shown us already—that what is at stake here goes far beyond mere military success or failure to the preservation of one's personal moral character and *libertas*. In this way Lucan has Brutus depict victory and defeat as concepts operating on *two different planes* concurrently. For Brutus, the traditional sense of victory in the military/political sphere exists alongside the more philosophical idea of personal victory and freedom. As we will see in the next speech, Cato expands on this latter sense, arguing that more than just *personal* attributes are at stake, but at this point Brutus focuses exclusively upon Cato's personal integrity, expressed most succinctly with Brutus's description of Cato as *immunem corrupti moribus aevi*. Recognizing the two levels at which the victory/defeat theme operates in Lucan is crucial precisely because it offers the possibility that Cato might be defeated on one level and yet still hold the potential of being victorious on the other.

To summarize Brutus's Stoic argument thus far: 1) it must surely be Cato's highest goal to behave as a Stoic *sapiens*, 2) this will require Cato to keep his *virtus* intact, 3) civil war is bad and will corrupt the *virtus* of anyone who participates in it, 4) therefore Cato cannot participate or else he will cease to be an *exemplum* of right action.[24] Everyone else who allows themselves to be guided into civil war by self-destructive

[24] The certainty of these arguments on Brutus's part suggests that he sees them in terms of what the Stoics called *kataleptic* impressions, namely those containing propositions that must necessarily be true. On this term, see the fine summary of Brennan (2005: 66-79).

motives reveals a *virtus* that has been compromised and defeated, and this in turn results in their loss of true freedom.[25] Brutus's assumption underlying all of this of course is that Cato is *not* like everyone else, for he has retained his *virtus* and thus his freedom; he is the one exception who remains personally unconquered and free. To Brutus, this preservation of personal *virtus* and *libertas* is what matters above all else, certainly more than traditional military victory on the battlefield. It is important to note also that, by extension, this ethical self-preservation matters more even than the fate of Rome and her people.

Cato should avoid any involvement (260-281)

According to this argument, however, Cato's "victory of virtue" at the second, more personal and philosophical level is entirely contingent upon his non-participation, for this is the only path that can preserve Cato's *virtus* from being tarnished by the *nefas* of civil war. The preceding section focused more upon prior motives and the initial cost of involvement to Cato's character and image, but now Brutus turns his attention to the dire consequences of involvement once the battle would already be underway.

Involvement discussed in general terms (260-273)

(260-266) Warning of the dangers posed to Cato's *virtus* by involvement
(266-273) The tranquil rewards of staying aloof

> ne tantum, o superi, liceat feralibus armis,
> has etiam movisse manus. nec pila lacertis
> missa tuis caeca telorum in nube ferentur:
> ne tanta in cassum virtus eat, ingeret omnis
> se belli fortuna tibi. quis nolet in isto

[25] From a Stoic perspective, one would say that all these are led not by virtuous reason in accordance with Nature but rather by their misguided desire for things they think are good but are in fact wicked things (assents to false impressions) or are at the very least by a desire for one of what the Stoics called indifferents, namely those things that are inherently neither good nor bad for a person's *virtus*. On the distinction between Stoic goods and indifferents, see Brennan (2005: 36-45); also Reydams-Schils (2005: 59-69).

ense mori, quamvis alieno vulnere labens,
et scelus esse tuum? melius tranquilla sine armis
otia solus ages, sicut caelestia semper
inconcussa suo volvuntur sidera lapsu.
fulminibus propior terrae succenditur aer,
imaque telluris ventos tractusque coruscos
flammarum accipiunt; nubis excedit Olympus.
lege deum minimas rerum discordia turbat,
pacem magna tenent. (2.260-273)

O gods above, do not go so far as to grant deadly arms the right to rouse *this man's* hands too! No spear cast from your shoulders will be borne along unseen amidst the cloud of missiles: lest such great *virtus* be wasted, every fortune of war will pour itself out upon you. Who—though already collapsing from other wounds—would not want to perish upon *your* blade and become *your* crime? The better course would be for you to lead a life of leisure off by yourself, a tranquil time with no taking up of arms, just like the starry heavens glide along, always undisturbed by their own rotating motion. Closer to earth, the air is set ablaze by thunderbolts, and the ground surface receives storm-winds and flashing courses of flame; yet Olympus rises above the clouds. By divine decree, *discordia* throws the small things into confusion, but great things retain their peace.

Brutus starts this section with a strong flourish as he makes a direct appeal to the gods themselves: surely the gods in their justice would not grant civil war the power to taint the hands of *such* a man like this (*has etiam manus*). This is a strong rhetorical strategy, for right from the start it suggests that since *even the gods* want Cato to be pure and virtuous, they too surely would want him to stay out of the fray.[26] Turning then to address Cato again, Brutus continues with an argument that reverses the angle he had previously taken: it is not just that participating would irreparably harm Cato's *virtus*; the very fact that he has such lofty *virtus* in the first place would render it impossible for him to participate in any normal or effective way. Cato could not hope for any anonymity

[26] Within the Stoic goal of living in accordance with Nature, the concepts of "god" and "fate" were fairly interchangeable; cf. Brennan (2005: 235). This was especially true in Lucan; cf. Moreschini (2005: 135): "Whenever Lucan speaks of fate, fortune, or the gods, he means the unutterable decree of destiny to which he aptly gives different names…" Brutus's employment of the gods here thus rhetorically elevates the wish for Cato to stay disengaged to the status of Cato's naturally-ordered fate.

(*nec pila lacertis missa tuis caeca telorum in nube ferentur*), and thus his virtuous presence in the midst of such universal *nefas* would act like a beacon drawing all the perverted attention of others onto himself (*ne tanta in cassum virtus eat, ingeret omnis se belli fortuna tibi*).[27] The scenario that Brutus creates envisions a mob of opponents all vying to have their final, fatal wound inflicted by Cato just so they can have the "reward" of getting to inflict Cato with the criminal guilt of civil war (*quis nolet in isto ense mori, quamvis alieno vulnere labens, et scelus esse tuum?*).

What is fascinating about this scenario is that it constructs a kind of perverted form of the *devotio ducis* famously described by Livy in his account of the Battle of Veseris (8.6.8–8.9.1).[28] In this battle against the Latin forces, P. Decius Mus was given the power to secure victory for the rest of the Roman army by "devoting" himself as *piaculum* in which he would charge the enemy by himself, receive their death blows, and through his death transfer to the enemy the guilt of the Roman people and the subsequent penalties required by the gods. The Latins do in fact kill Decius Mus, unknowingly condemning themselves to defeat and death. It is fitting for Lucan in an epic on civil war to make reference, both here and in Cato's speech, to the famous *devotio* episode of Decius Mus, for in his accounting Livy himself describes the battle as essentially a

---

[27] Brutus is playing a bit loose with his arguments, ignoring the possible inconsistencies between his current line of reasoning and that which he has argued up to this point. The previous argument was that true *virtus* would be incompatible with participation in the civil war, with the implicit assumption that were Cato to enter the fighting he would either lose his *virtus* or prove that he never had it to begin with. Here, however, Brutus is assuming for argument's sake that Cato would retain his *virtus* should he decide to join the ranks. This inconsistency should be seen not as a rhetorical mistake on the part of Brutus (and Lucan) but rather as the speaker's spirited attempt to accumulate numerous arguments that cover as many bases as possible.

[28] A full discussion of the *devotio* theme can be found in the following chapter on Cato's speech, since Cato invokes it specifically as a model for his own actions (2.308). I provide here enough of Livy's account to make sense of the important image it offers of a leader who becomes the collective target of the enemy, thus turning his defeat into an opportunity for victory.

recreation of civil war in that the opposing armies were remarkably alike in language, customs, arms, and military institutions; in happier times the soldiers on opposing sides had even mingled with each other during joint campaigns.[29] Livy even uses the term *bellum civile* to describe the conflict: *fuit autem civili maxime bello pugna similis; adeo nihil apud Latinos dissonum ab Romana re praeter animos erat* (8.8.2).

However, Brutus's scenario subverts this standard *devotio* scene in two key ways.[30] It reverses the positions of the individual and the group, for the imagined opponents of Cato take on the role of Decius in that they seek to get themselves killed so that they can bring their criminal guilt upon the head of Cato, who in turn takes on the role of the opposing Latin army and now doomed because he has participated in the killing. Unlike the scenario in Livy, however, those who would seek to die at Cato's hands cannot *transfer* their guilt and thereby save themselves as in a true *piaculum*; they can only infect Cato with their shared guilt so that all are doomed together.

Brutus's altered version of the *devotio* scene thus accomplishes three things. First, the fact that the penalty of guilt cannot be transferred but only shared reinforces Lucan's position, consistent from the proem onward, that in this epic it is defeat that overwhelms all participants. Second, it succinctly sets up Cato's own invocation of the *devotio* model in his answering speech. Brutus's inverted version of the original model

---

[29] Livy 8.6.15.

[30] What Fantham (1992: 129) identifies in this scene is "a pointed perversion of the epic situation in which a warrior, killed by an Achilles or Aeneas, takes comfort from their greatness." While Lucan may indeed be incorporating elements of this kind of "epic situation," he is more properly developing a perversion of the *devotio ducis* scene. Cato will specifically invoke the *devotio ducis* in his speech when explaining what he hopes to accomplish by participating. Fantham does recognize that Cato's speech also picks up the same theme of an individual who "expects to be the focus of attention and bear the brunt of the enemy's attack," but she does not connect it this to a development of the *devotio* image. Cf. Sklenář (2003: 65): "Brutus suggests nothing less than that Cato's participation in the civil war will trap him in the same pattern of inversions as Lucan's other epic combatants."

from Livy acts as an invitation to examine the ways in which Cato will subsequently appropriate the *devotio* as a desired model for his own actions. Third, Brutus's version draws attention to the basic problem that Cato must face: any successful *devotio* on Cato's part would ensure the death and destruction of his enemies—the very ones who are also his fellow Romans. If Cato were to commit an act that would transfer destruction upon his own kinsmen, then he would be just as criminal as the other architects of civil war that Lucan decries throughout the epic.[31] This is a key issue that Cato will have to face in his own formulation of the *devotio* model if he is to employ it with any success or effectiveness.

In the second half of this section of the speech, Brutus has moved his immediate focus away from the threats posed to Cato's *virtus*, looking now to the more positive perspective of the many perceived rewards of peace and tranquility that await the man who stays removed from such conflicts (*melius tranquilla sine armis otia solus ages*). Three key elements emerge in this argument pointing to those things which Brutus suggests are to be valued: peaceful inactivity (*tranquilla otia*), the avoidance of violence (*sine armis*), and isolation (*solus*). Taken together, these elements argue for Cato not just to stand placidly off to the side but to remove himself from the far-reaching sphere of civil war altogether, for only then would his all-important *virtus* be truly secure from any danger of contact with civil war's *nefas*.

On this point we can find parallels in Seneca's frequent treatment of the value of *otium*. Sometime in the early 60's, Seneca wrote a treatise on this precise topic entitled *De Otio* which strongly advocates for retirement by illustrating how it will benefit the

[31] E.g. *BC* 1.87-97.

virtus of the Stoic *sapiens*.[32] It is worth noting just how similar the arguments that Brutus makes in the *Bellum Civile* sound in comparison with those in the *De Otio*.[33] Discussing the overall value of retirement or *otium*, Seneca writes:

> *Licet nihil aliud, quod sit salutare, temptemus, proderit tamen per se ipsum secedere; meliores erimus singuli*. (Sen. *De Otio* 1.1)
>
> (Even if we should attempt nothing else that may be of benefit, nevertheless retirement will by itself be a useful thing, for we will be better people off by ourselves.)

Seneca's *singuli* is echoed by Brutus's *solus* (2.267), showing that they both share a conception of *otium* as inherently bound up isolation. Furthermore, this kind of isolation will clearly preclude any kind of military involvement (*sine armis*). Were Cato to follow

---

[32] On the dating of this work, see Griffin (1976: 316). It is worth noting that Seneca's opinions on the matter of retirement from public life do vary from one work to another such that he seems inconsistent in his recommendation of it, but it is perhaps more accurate to stress the notion of Seneca's *flexibility* on this point. As Griffin (1976: 341) points out, there was a high degree of flexibility in the Stoic doctrine on political involvement in the Middle Stoa. Stoicism was known in contrast to the Epicurean school for its general encouragement of political participation, but this push was by no means universal or unqualified. This is perhaps laid out most clearly in Cicero's *De Officiis* which generally argues for involvement on the basis of viewing productive service to society as an extension of justice and one's duty to live according to *natura*; Cicero however later illustrates that certain mitigating factors or *causae* could change the balance of the equation and lead a wise man to abandon political life and seek *otium* instead. As always, the perceived benefit or danger to the subject's *virtus* is paramount in these calculations. The flexibility caused by these various *causae* thus allow Seneca to speak for or against political involvement based on the rhetorical situation of the moment; this is why he can alternately praise Cicero (*Cons. ad Marciam* 20.5) and then chide him (*De Brev.* 5.1ff) for his political activities during the consulship, in the first case as it allowed him to act as the virtuous savior of the Republic, and in the second case as it prevented him from pursuing a worthy life of contemplative philosophy. On this example, see Rudich (1997: 57). Toward the end of his career, however, Seneca increasingly adopts the stance that retirement or *otium* offers the greater share of opportunity for the development of *virtus*, and Griffin (1976: 334) argues that by the time Seneca writes his *Epistolae ad Lucilium* (c. 62-64) we see that "the call to *otium* in the Letters, though accompanied by conditions, cautions, and justifications, is a categorical imperative."

[33] The *De Otio* stands as a particularly applicable model of thought for Brutus's speech in Lucan because both Seneca and Brutus are discussing the best conduct specifically for a Stoic *sapiens* as opposed to what might be best for an average person susceptible to all the usual vices. The dramatic difference of course is that Seneca speaks in theoretical terms, whereas Brutus speaks with Cato the supposed Stoic *sapiens* right in front of him.

this path, he could be a passive observer only.[34] In short, the world of *tranquilla otia* purports to offer the best and clearest path to a life of unhindered *virtus*. This would hold true at any time, but with the advent of civil war, the choice should be even more obvious to Cato.

While Stoic doctrine did generally encourage political involvement, it was also the case that the appearance of mitigating *causae*—such as a dangerous regime or civil war—could lead a *sapiens* to conclude that *secedere* was the wisest option. Seneca provides a clear example of this kind of argument later in his *De Otio*:

> si res publica corruptior est quam ut aduivari possit, si occupata est malis, non nitetur sapiens in supervacuum nec se nihil profuturus impendet… potest ergo et ille, cui omnia adhuc in integro sunt, antequam ullas experiatur temptestates, in tuto subsistere et protinus commendare se bonis artibus et inlibatus otium exigere, virtutium cultor, quae exerceri etiam quietissimis possunt. hoc nempe ab homine exigitur, ut prosit hominibus, si fieri potest, multis, si minus, paucis, si minus, proximis, si minus, sibi. nam cum se utilem ceteris efficit, commune agit negotium.
> (*De Otio* 3.3-5)

> If the *respublica* is corrupt beyond help, if it is overrun with evils, the *sapiens* will not set his foundation upon a lost cause, nor will he expend himself with no hope of gaining anything to show for his efforts… It is thus possible for a man, whose fortunes are still intact and before he should experience any of life's storms, to settle himself away in a place of safety, continuously devote himself to the good arts, and finish out a life of *otium* intact as a cultivator of those *virtutes* which can be practiced by even those who are in the deepest retirement. It is of course demanded from such a man that that he work to benefit other people—if it can be so, many people; if less, then a few people; if less, then those closest to him; if less, then himself. For when a man makes himself useful for others, he engages in the common good.

For Brutus, too, the crucial question of involvement or retirement hinges upon the principle of greatest perceived benefit. As we have already seen in analyzing the opening

[34] A few lines later (*De Otio* 1.1) Seneca describes benefits of this kind of peaceful seclusion: *tunc potest obtineri quod semel placuit, ubi nemo intervenit, qui iudicium adhuc imbecillum populo adiutore detorqueat; tunc potest vita aequali et uno tenore procedere, quam propositis deversissimis scindimus*.

of the speech (2.242-247), Brutus sees Cato's true value primarily in terms of the *exemplum virtutis* he has to offer, both to himself and to others. The world of civil war that Cato finds himself trapped in, however, could very easily qualify as a *res publica corruptior quam ut aduivari possit* and *occupata malis*, and in this view he would thus be perfectly justified in seeking *otium* in retirement.[35] Yet Brutus goes a step further and treats the choice as a virtual imperative: since civil war threatens the validity of Cato's *virtus* and thus his *exemplum*, retirement is the only thing that will allow Cato to continue offering his unsullied *exemplum* for the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people.[36]

Since the *res publica* is in such a bad state and perhaps irredeemable, the implied question that Brutus holds out is this: what could Cato hope to accomplish through participating in the civil war anyway? The biggest difficulty that Lucan's contemporaries such as Seneca faced in interpreting the historical fact of Cato's participation in civil war lay in identifying his *motive*, for which Seneca and perhaps many others of the Neronian period seem to have no satisfying answer.[37] What people like Seneca can do is show that

---

[35] As Griffin (1976: 318) explains in discussing the word's use by Seneca in *De Brev*., "*otium*" essentially means "the acquisition and practice of *sapientia*: that is the true *otium*; everything else—political life, literary activity, the pursuit of luxury and pleasure that constitutes the vulgar *otium*—is to be rejected." This is also clearly what Brutus has in mind when he urges Cato to seek out *tranquilla otia*.

[36] This idea is neatly summed up in Seneca's *De Otio* 6.4: *quo animo ad otium sapiens secedit? ut sciat se tum quoque ea acturum, per quae posteris prosit.* For Brutus—as indeed I believe for Lucan—it is the lesson Cato has to offer to the *posteris* that will prove most valuable. There is a differentiation between them, however. Whereas Brutus thinks that the only choice that can preserve Cato's *exemplum* is *otium* through non-participation, Lucan will show through Cato's speech that retirement is not in fact required for Cato's *virtus* to remain intact.

[37] This is seen for example in *Ep*. 14.11 which has already been discussed earlier in this chapter. After raising the problem of Cato's participation in Ep. 14, Seneca proceeds to avoid answering the conundrum altogether by changing the subject: *sed postea videbimus an sapienti opera rei publicae danda sit; interim ad host e Stoicos voco, qui a republica exclusi secesserunt ad colendam vitam et humano generi iura condenda sine ulla potentioris offensa*… (*Ep*.14.14). Rudich (1997: 58-9) cites *Ep*. 14 as a clear example of the unresolved tension that results when Seneca tries to appropriate Cato as a model for personal life while mostly ignoring the very real political dimensions to his character. Later on he writes, "In fact, from

Cato's experiences in the civil war demonstrated his *constantia* and *virtus*, thus providing later generations with a very abstract figure who can offer *exempla* of proper living and proper dying—but not much more.[38]

Brutus closes this section of the speech by appealing to the Stoic ideal of *apatheia*, the absence of harmful emotions.[39] He launches into a lengthy meteorological simile that compares the *tranquilla otia* amidst the dangers of civil war to the peace enjoyed by the stars in the upper atmosphere while terrible storms rage below (2.267-271).[40] He specifically refers to the *caelestia sidera* that are *inconcussa* while they go about their eternal cycles, in harmony with *natura*.[41] Olympus, the lofty residence of the divine—and by extension the wise man who retreats into *tranquilla otia*—rises above the clouds and the lower terrors of lightning, blasts of wind, and flames. Brutus boldly claims that this illustrates the eternal, divine law which decrees that *discordia*, the chaotic disruption of the natural order (here represented by civil war), only affects the *minimas rerum* but passes by the *magna* and leaves them in peace. Brutus clearly envisions Cato

---

this Stoic perspective, Cato's political involvement was an embarrassment: it betrayed his lack of *apatheia* and his inability to achieve the ultimate goal, the state of self-sufficiency."

[38] Some notable illustrations of this process of abstract "*exempla* for general life" include: *De Prov*. 2.7-12, 3.14; *Ep*. 13.14, 67.7, 98.12. The *Epistulae* especially, written in Seneca's waning years, show an intense interest in "dying well" and suicide, in relation to which Cato's own famous suicide is frequently mentioned as an *exemplum*. As I have already mentioned, the political lessons that Cato's life could offer are glaringly absent from the exemplary tradition.

[39] Ahl (1976: 237) discusses features of this passage that appeal to this Stoic *apatheia* for the *sapiens*.

[40] Cf. Salemme (2002: 9-10).

[41] Cf. the first words of Brutus's speech when he asked Cato whether he would guard peace while keeping himself firm upon the *inconcussa vestigia* in a *dubio mundo* (2.248). As mentioned previously, Fantham (1992: 126) when commenting on 2.248 points out that *concutere*, which appears only these two places in Lucan, is taken from Seneca who repeatedly uses forms of *concutere* in setting "his wise man against the background of world destruction, the traditional test of Stoic *constantia*." Cf. its use at *Thy*. 992-993; *Q.Nat*. 3.27, 6.2; *De Tranq*. 2.3; *De Const*. 5.4; *Ep*. 59.14. Given that *inconcussa* is a part of Seneca's Stoic vocabulary, it is notable that both instances of it in Lucan are put in the mouth of Brutus.

as separate from the *vulgus*, the *minimas rerum*, and instead firmly situated among the ranks of *magna*—at least if Cato were to choose *otium* and non-participation.[42]

On the surface, the offer of *otium* as a means of escaping the ruin that will befall everyone else has the appearance of sound advice, but what Brutus does not realize is that it is in direct contradiction to the universal dictum declared at the start of the epic: *in se magna ruunt* (1.81). Everything, even the *magna*, is affected by civil war's *discordia*. Brutus thinks there can be a path of escape from the universal defeat inflicted by civil war, but Lucan's epic proves Brutus wrong. There is no escaping civil war in this world. Lucan's Cato will also agree on this point, yet as we will see, he will argue that he can still accomplish something beneficial through that defeat.

Involvement discussed specifically in political terms (273-281)

> quam laetae Caesaris aures
> accipient tantum venisse in proelia civem!
> nam praelata suis numquam diversa dolebit
> castra ducis Magni. nimium placet ipse Catoni,
> si bellum civile placet. pars magna senatus
> et duce privato gesturus proelia consul
> sollicitant proceresque alii; quibus adde Catonem
> sub iuga Pompei, toto iam liber in orbe
> solus Caesar erit.

> How happily will Caesar's ears receive the news that so great a citizen has entered the battle! Caesar truly will never be upset that the opposing camps of Pompey should be preferred to his own—if civil war delights Cato, he proves that Caesar delights him too! Under the leadership of a private citizen, a great part of the Senate, one of the consuls, and other leaders are about to wage war. How they entice me! Add Cato to the ranks of those under the yoke of Pompey, and then the only free man in all the world will be Caesar.

Having established what he sees as the broader reasons Cato cannot enter the fray, Brutus moves now to more specifically political factors that should keep Cato from

[42] Cf. Brisset (1964: 149).

getting involved. He frames the situation by laying out the two obvious military options: were Cato to join the fighting, he could join either the camp of Pompey or the camp of Caesar. Yet both options, Brutus argues, result in essentially the same outcome. Whichever camp he might join, Cato will be doing Caesar a tremendous favor simply by joining the fighting at all (*nimium placet ipse Catoni, si bellum civile placet*). The first reason for this is that Cato's involvement would in effect be a sign that that Cato approves of civil war and views it as legitimate. With this argument, here Cato is cast as a kind of moral judge, notably the position he enjoyed when he first appeared in the epic back at 1.128 (*victrix causa deis placuit sed victa Catoni*), yet if he is to retain his moral position he ought not decide upon either.[43] The second reason, however, touches upon a more critical issue. Any involvement will infect Cato with civil war's *nefas* and thus destroy his ability to offer himself as an *exemplum virtutis* to those who come after him, and it in this role as *exemplum* that Cato can be of greatest benefit to his fellow Romans and pose his greatest threat to Caesar. Thus, in the final analysis, for Cato to join either side would be the moral equivalent of joining Caesar, approving of his mission to establish himself as *dominus* over *Roma*, and ultimately removing himself from a position of any lasting influence on his own or later generations.

Brutus here focuses on the most critical issue of all, the theme of *libertas* that is so central to Lucan's epic.[44] Here in his final argument against involvement, Brutus gets

---

[43] Fantham (1992: 130) notes this connection. The use of *placere* in both passages as the verb of moral judgment helps cement the connection. Under the premises of Brutus's argument, if Cato joins the fighting, he will forfeit the moral rightness of his position which will in turn undermine his role as a *iudex* with anything meaningful to say.

[44] Fantham (1992: 131) follows Wirszubski in noting that *libertas* was "for the Roman senatorial class a watchword denoting their right to govern according to the laws of the *res publica*." Brutus here uses *libertas* in a context that notably encompasses a clear political dimension in addition to the private kind of personal *libertas*, which is the sense in which Seneca most often employs the word. On the generally

to the heart of the matter by laying down what he knows should be the most persuasive reason not to join the fighting: doing so will mean a loss of Cato's own *libertas* and the acceptance of *servitudo* at Caesar's hands. Taking it for granted that any cooperation with Caesar is tantamount to surrendering one's *libertas* to the control of that would-be *dominus*, Brutus turns to showing how joining the ranks of Pompey would require the same kind of surrender. Pompey, who might seem like the right choice in comparison with Caesar's more aggressive push for domination, already has under his control most of the *Senatus* and a multitude of other political leaders, including a consul—all the while Pompey himself is acting as a private citizen (*pars magna senatus et duce privato gesturus proelia consul sollicitant proceresque alii*)! This last point is intended to be the most shocking, for here we see that the *consul*, the proper possessor of *imperium* over the armies of Rome, has willingly subjugated himself under the power of another would-be *dominus*, one who has no constitutional *imperium* at all.

Brutus drives the overall point home by using the word *iuga* to describe the relationship between Pompey and those who join his camp (*sub iuga Pompei*).[45] If Cato were to fight against the tyrannical ambitions of Caesar by simply joining forces with another *dux* with tyrannical ambitions, then he would ironically forfeit that very *libertas* which he was fighting to protect. In such a case, if Cato were to lose his *virtus* and *libertas*—those very traits which make up the *exemplum* that his life can offer—Caesar would indeed be the last free man left (*toto iam liber in orbe solus Caesar erit*). In the end, as Brutus forcefully argues, it is in the interest not only of his own *virtus* and *libertas*

---

charged significance of *libertas* during the Neronian period, see Wirszubski (1950: 136ff) and Sullivan (1985: 115-6).

[45] Fantham (1992: 131) concludes, "Thus Pompey's unconstitutional command is seen as a kind of tyranny, which makes obedience to it slavery."

but also of all those who might one day look to Cato as an *exemplum* that Cato should not and must not involve himself in the waging of civil war.

A New Option: Cato can involve himself to fight for *leges* and *libertas* (281-284)

> quod si pro legibus arma
> ferre iuvat patriis libertatemque tueri,
> nunc neque Pompei Brutum neque Caesaris hostem,
> post bellum victoris habes. sic fatur…
>
> *But* if you deem it best to take up arms on behalf of the laws of the fatherland and to watch over *libertas*, then right here and now the Brutus you have is the enemy neither of Pompey nor of Caesar, but, after the war, the enemy of the *victor*.
> Thus he spoke…

But… Brutus's final sentence presents a sudden and remarkable about-face. Gone are the repeated arguments for Cato to leave the whole mess behind and protect himself by retreating into *tranquilla otia*, and in their place we find a wholly new third option. Instead of 1) joining either Pompey or Caesar or 2) disengaging altogether, Brutus suddenly offers the choice 3) to take up arms not on behalf of either of the *duces* but rather on behalf of the *leges patriae* upon which the Republic rests (*si pro legibus patriis*). This is actually an appeal for the preservation of memory, since the *leges patriae* ground Rome in rich continuity with its past.

This sudden departure from what Brutus has been saying up to this point must not be overlooked.[46] It appears to represent a military option (*arma ferre*), but it is one of a very specific character. First, its aim is radically different from any other in that

[46] As Brisset (1964: 150) comments, "Cette conclusion du discours est importante."

specifically does not seek *victoria* but rather *libertas* and *leges patriae*.[47] Second, its hostile target is not Pompey or Caesar as individuals *per se* but instead the more conceptual—and sinister—figure of the *victor*. Brutus furthermore sets the time frame of this option by acknowledging that the designation of *victor* cannot be made until *post bellum*. In short, the civil war between Pompey and Caesar must be won by one or the other before Cato can be in a position to begin his involvement.

Thus we find here at the end of Brutus's speech the striking possibility raised that continuing the fight against the winner on behalf of a defeated Rome will actually be worth doing, as if such a fight *post bellum* could actually accomplish something. As we turn now to Cato's answering speech, we are in a position to see if he can provide us with some kind of answer. For the vast majority of this speech, Brutus has laid out two options, namely the non-involvement of *apatheia* that he supports, set against the engagement that he rejects. Lucan then uses his speech to set up the reasons that Cato will invoke shortly for why he will—indeed why he must—involve himself. But here at the very end, Lucan throws into the speech a new choice that, as we will see, frames the nature and time-frame of Cato's involvement in the *nefas* of civil war.

This closing section of the speech thus functions as the perfect introduction to Cato's speech, for it sets forth the parameters under which he will attempt to enter the fray without destroying either his own *libertas* or the *exemplum* he can offer. Throughout, the preservation of memory has been one of Brutus's key motives in his arguments, for he sees that the very survival of Cato as didactic *exemplum* that can be

[47] Here at the end of his speech, Brutus correctly exposes the heart of the matter, namely that *Libertas* and the *patria* are what are really at stake in the civil war. Cato confirms this in his speech when he declares that *Roma et Libertas* will be his objects of devotion in the coming conflict (2.302-3).

recalled by others is at stake. As the next speech will reveal, however, Cato hopes to be able to offer an *exemplum* whose range and scope represents so much more.

CHAPTER 6
CREATING A MONUMENT: CATO'S SPEECH (2.284-325)

Cato Pro Patria

In this chapter we come at last to Cato and his speech. He is first described in the narrative leading up to Brutus's speech, so it will be appropriate here to revisit that text and examine the ways in which Lucan develops this important first impression:

> at non magnanimi percussit pectora Bruti
> terror et in tanta pavidi formidine motus
> pars populi lugentis erat, sed nocte sopora,
> Parrhasis obliquos Helice cum verteret axes,
> atria cognati pulsat non ampla Catonis.
> invenit insomni volventem publica cura
> fata virum casusque urbis cunctisque timentem
> securumque sui, farique his vocibus orsus: (2.234-241)

> BUT terror did NOT strike the heart of great-souled Brutus, nor was he a part of the panic-stricken people in mourning, disturbed by such great dread—but he, in the sleep of night, when Parrhasian Helike bends toward the horizon, knocks upon the modest front door of his relative Cato. *Him* he finds wide awake, pondering with never-resting care the concerns of the state, the dooms of men, and the destruction of the City, fearing for all others yet at peace regarding himself; and so he began his speech with these words:

As already discussed in the previous chapter, this entire introductory passage shows that a continuity exists with the preceding narratives while at the same time emphasizing that it is the antithesis of what has gone before. The continuity lies foremost in what has *not* changed: Brutus and Cato still face precisely the same situation that the Roman people at large face, namely their imminent defeat at the hands of Caesar. As we shall see, however, what *has* changed is the response Cato will give.

Lucan's description of Cato forms roughly the second half of the passage. The first detail we find is that Brutus has come to a house characterized by *atria non ampla*. This small detail sets the stage for a figure remarkable for all the ways in which he is

different from his contemporaries; Cato's life is to be one not marked by extravagance but by modesty and self-control. It is this kind of Cato that Brutus finds awake and alert, even though it is still night time.[1] He is still awake for the telling reason that he is deep in thought over the "public things" (*publica*), the issues that directly affect Rome herself. We read that he is literally turning the issues of the *Res Publica* over in his mind (*volventem*) "with never-resting care" (*insomni cura*). Even more than this, as extensions of the *publica*, he is found pondering both the "dooms of men" (*fata virum*) and the destructions of Rome (*casusque urbis*).

What Lucan emphasizes throughout is the fact that Cato's focus is—and will continue to be—upon the *publica*. This sets him apart from both Caesar and Pompey, the other two main characters in the epic, for their main concern is who will defeat the other and become the *dominus* of Rome.[2] It also rebuts the thrust of Brutus's argument which urged Cato to comply with what he saw as the Stoic "necessity" of preserving his *virtus* by staying disengaged. The appearance of Cato allows Lucan to compel us to turn our attention to the chief thing that was in danger of being overlooked and forgotten amidst the chaos of civil war: *Rome herself*. By focusing his attention upon Rome—her people (*fata virum*) and their imminent destruction (*casusque urbis*)—Cato confirms these

---

[1] It is interesting to note the ways in which this introduction to Cato carefully echoes the first appearance of Lucretia at Livy 1.57.9. Like Cato, Lucretia is a model of good character (in her case, *pudicitia* and *castitas*) who is visited at night (*sed nocte sera*) and found (*inveniunt*) to be alert and active in positive, productive activity. The parallels continue in that both later find themselves in a position of defeat and commit suicide on virtuous principles. Even more intriguing are the possible parallels of both being instrumental in opposing what was seen to be a tyrannical regime—and perhaps even in being a catalyst for regime change.

[2] Cf. 1.120-57 in which Lucan describes each of the two as motivated by a desire to be superior to all others (*nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarve priorem | Pompeiusve parem*, 1.125-6); note also especially the somber warning of the astrologer Figulus at 1. 670: *cum domino pax ista venit*. The *victor* will by definition become a *dominus*, i.e. a tyrant.

subjects as central and meaningful themes in the epic. In short, Cato makes Rome matter again.

One striking feature of Cato's portrait here that deserves a brief comment is the fact that he is described as "fearing" (*timentem*). According to Stoic thought, the *sapiens* does not assent to fear or any other emotion (*pathe*), since these are based off of false beliefs regarding what is actually true about the world and what will actually benefit his own virtue.[3] There are a number of responses to this that need to be made. First and foremost, Lucan is not trying to place his epic world within a strictly Stoic system, nor is he interested in creating a Cato who strictly adheres to traditional Stoic doctrine. In contrast, I concur with a recent trend in Lucan scholarship that convincingly argues we should instead read Lucan's world as one that is merely characterized by a general—and highly flexible—Stoic *influence* throughout.[4] Even given this, we can see that Cato's

---

[3] The emotions, or *pathe* to use the technical term, to a Stoic meant not what we today loosely call emotions but were more specifically, as Rist (1969: 26) writes, "excessive and irrational impulses." Cf. also the summary of Stoic emotions in Brennan (2005; 82-113) and Becker (2004). In other words, a *pathos* is technically an incorrect belief, not just a rush of feeling. Brennan (2005: 92) cites the example of 'wrath': "In the case of the emotions, then, the Stoics would have felt justified in saying that 'wrath' properly denominates a certain belief, rather than a certain feeling-tone, because it is the belief that provides the explanation in claims like, 'his wrath led him to strike his friend.'" Cicero in the *De Finibus* has his own Cato as an interlocutor describe the emotions for the Stoics as *perturbationes animorum* (3.10). Cf. also Seneca *Ep*. 56.12-14. On the debated issue of Cato's emotions, see Ahl (1976: 244), Vögler (1968: 263ff), Fantham (1992: 134), Bartsch (1997: 119), Rudich (1997: 127-9), Hershkowitz (1998: 234-7), De Nadaï (2000: 287-92), Narducci (2002: 395-401), Sklenář (2003: 62, 69ff), Wildberger (2005: 67ff), Behr (2007: 131ff, 171-8). I will discuss the Stoic views on the emotions in more detail below when further emotive vocabulary is used later in the speech.

[4] Rudich (1997: 129) for example notes that though "Lucan's epic is permeated with Stoic concepts, categories, and vocabulary" it does not define his epic or his characters. This type of view stands as a corrective to the more traditional, positive views of Lucan's Stoicism such as Marti (1945), Ahl (1976) and even the more-nuanced reading of George (1991); it also stands as a corrective to more recent negative views, especially those that view Lucan's Cato as a Stoic failure given his inability to uphold Stoic doctrines consistently, e.g. Henderson (1998) and Sklenář (2003). Wildberger (2005) provides the clearest *status quaestionis* of the problem, arguing against reading Lucan as presenting a "by-the-book" Stoic system. Citing the numerous incompatible readings of Lucan's supposed Stoicism made by scholars over the years, she writes: "Eine Erklärung für diese disparate Forschungslage scheint mir zu sein, dass wir im *Bellum civile* keine systematische, philosophische Auseinandersetzung mit stoischen Gedanken vorfinden, dass kein stoisches oder anti-stoisches Weltbild gezeichnet wird und dass auch die Erzähler und Figuren nicht in erster Linie Typen – oder Karikaturen – einer stoischen Anthropologie sein sollen" (59).

'fear' is of a completely different kind than that displayed by the *populus*. The *timor* of the crowds in Rome was expressly self-focused and led to panicky flight and the consequent abandonment of *virtus* and *memoria*. Cato's 'fear,' however, reveals an outlook that is focused on the larger welfare and specifically not on himself, and thus the word takes on the more general meaning of caring concern for others. The consequences of Cato's kind of "fear" are thus different as well: unlike the *populus*, Cato is in control of his reaction rather than letting it control him. He is thus not trapped within it like the rest of the people of Rome; he is not subject to the kind of self-defeat that the people's reaction brings. Finally, given that the Stoic *pathe* constitute incorrect beliefs, Cato's fear is only harmful if it stems from an incorrect belief regarding the worth of Rome and her people. As his speech will clearly demonstrate, he asserts that Rome and the future of her people are precisely what matter.

Cato Prepares To Speak (2.284-285)

After Brutus concludes his speech, Cato now takes the stage and delivers his response. Over the course of his speech, Cato declares his intent to involve himself in the civil war and offers a defense of this decision. In so doing, he sets forth two intended courses of action, and these become models by which his involvement in this epic may be evaluated.[5]

Wildberger, however, still keeps her focus upon a now-chaotic Stoicism, such that in her view people like Cato are stripped of much of their ability to act when the Stoic principles upon which they are defined no longer function coherently (e.g. 73ff). On the contrary, I argue that we must regard Stoicism in Lucan (and in Cato specifically) more as a pervasive *influence* and flexible *ethos* than as a rigid code of doctrines that defines the text. Understanding Stoicism and its relationship to the text is still important, but Cato's strict adherence to it ought not be the chief benchmark for assessing the success or failure of his character.

[5] Given that this speech gives us our first extended impression of Cato, numerous studies have been written on it. Cf. the commentaries of Van Campen (1991) and Fantham (1992); see also Brisset (1964: 151-52), Tasler (1972: 161-70), Lebek (1976: 178-89), Ahl (1976: 239-46), Croisille (1982: 75-8), Johnson (1987: 38-42), Hardie (1993: 30-2), George (1991: 251-4), Bartsch (1997: 73-5, 117-23), Rudich (1997: 118-23),

at illi
arcano sacras reddit Cato pectore voces.

But Cato gave in reply sacred words from the hidden depths of his breast.

Lucan sets the tone right up front by saying that Cato's reply constitutes *sacras voces*. What is so striking about this choice of wording is that it frames Cato's speech as the functional equivalent of a divine oracle.[6] Cato here is given voices which are *sacras*, as if they belonged to a god, and a breast that is *arcanum*, suggesting that his own body is the oracular shrine set to reveal its hidden wisdom to Brutus. Such a picture is less startling when we look back and realize that Lucan is here merely completing a picture he started earlier when Brutus first approached Cato seeking wisdom and knowledge of the future, itself continuing a pattern begun by all those in Rome who sought out Arruns and Figulus in the end of Book 1. Brutus wants guidance, and Lucan's Cato substitutes for a divine oracle in providing it.

This type of introduction helps cement Cato's position as that of an authority figure in the epic. His introduction at 1.128 placed Cato effectively in competition with the gods (*victrix causa deis placuit sed victa Catoni*), and his elevation here to the role of divine oracle reinforces this status of an authority on what this civil war will mean to Rome. In line with the competition model established at 1.128, while the Romans sought

---

Hershkowitz (1998: 231-42), De Nadaï (2000: 282-97), Narducci (2001: 173-8), Narducci (2002: 383-404, 423-7), Salemme (2002: 14-7), Sklenář (2003: 67-72), Stover (2008: 573-4).

[6] The key word is *arcanum* which most generally refers to anything that is hidden or kept secret from public knowledge, but it frequently appears in conjunction with *fatum* specifically to refer to oracular pronouncements. Of the word's four instances in Vergil, three of them appear in this sense of the *arcana fatorum* (*Aeneid* 1.262, 6.72, 7.123), and Ovid also uses the phrase at *Met*. 2.639 (*fatorum arcana canebat*). For his part, Lucan uses *arcanum* ten more times in the *BC*, seven of which are located in episodes that explicitly center on oracles: Appius at Delphi (5.137, 198), Sextus at Erictho (6.431, 440, 514, 569), and Cato at Jupiter Ammon in Libya (9.544). This last instance is particularly helpful in this connection with its shared vocabulary in also describing Cato as *sanctus* (*sancto Catoni*, 9.555). Fantham (1992: 132) recognizes that Lucan "treats Cato's reply like an oracular response," but she does not develop its possible significance.

answers from the gods through haruspicy and astrology in Book 1, Brutus instead seeks out Cato who is ready to deliver a very different oracular response. As we have already seen, the gods merely communicated impending defeat, but Cato goes beyond recognizing defeat's inevitability to offer a plan of personal action intended to benefit those who are defeated by civil war. The message delivered by Cato may seem cryptic at first, if not hopeless, but as with any oracular message, sound and careful scrutiny can lead to an interpretation.

Cato's Speech (2.286-325)

After an initial refutation of Brutus's key contention that *virtus* demands non-involvement, Cato begins to reveal what he wishes he could accomplish through his involvement in the civil wars. An analysis of this response on Cato's part reveals two basic components to his proposed plan of action, around which this speech is structured. The speech concludes with a defense of Cato's decision to join Pompey's ranks that demonstrates his true motives on behalf of doomed *Roma* separate from the motives of either Pompey or Caesar.[7] The speech can be broken down into the following outline:

1. (286-288) Brutus refuted: *Virtus* demands involvement
2. (289-319) Two courses of action Cato wishes he could perform for the *Respublica*
    a. (289-303) Commemorating the death of *Roma* and *Libertas*
        i. (289-297) Involvement demanded by sense of public duty
            i-a. (289-292) Will I do nothing while the cosmos collapses?
            i-b. (292-297) Will I do nothing when even foreign lands are involved?
        ii. (297-303) Simile of a parent leading his children's funeral procession
    b. (304-319) Saving *Roma* by enacting a *devotio* on her behalf
        i. (304-307) Admission of *Roma*'s need to pay for its crimes
        ii. (308-311) *Devotio* as model for Cato's beneficial self-sacrifice
        iii. (312-319) Desired goals for Cato's self-sacrifice
            iii-a. (312-313) Absolve the sin debt owed the gods

[7] As with the Brutus speech, one may compare my outline with that of Lebek (1976: 181-2); mine differs in that it explicitly organizes the speech around the two proposed courses of action Cato states he wishes he could take with regard to his involvement in civil war.

iii-b. (314-319) End the need for war
3. (319-323) Decision to join Pompey's camp explained

Brutus refuted:* Virtus *demands involvement (286-288)

summum, Brute, nefas civilia bella fatemur,
sed quo fata trahunt virtus secura sequetur.
crimen erit superis et me fecisse nocentem.

> The greatest *nefas* of all, Brutus, is civil war, I agree—but where *fatum* pulls me, *virtus* will follow safe and unharmed. The guilt will lie with the gods for having made even *me* guilty.

Cato begins by meeting head-on the central argument in Brutus's speech, namely that *virtus* could not survive any involvement in civil war, and without *virtus* Cato could have no positive *exemplum* or memory to offer. He opens his entire argument by agreeing with the premise, already established by Brutus (as indeed by Lucan), that civil war is the *summum nefas*.[8] Cato does not in any way mitigate but in fact confirms the evil inherent to the *Roma*'s self-destruction that Lucan portrays so clearly both in the proem and in the preceding flashback narrative. Where Cato refutes Brutus is in his declaration that it is precisely his *virtus* that leads him to participate.

Answering the question of how this could be possible begins with Cato's explanation that *fatum* is what leads him. This was the very thing upon which he was focusing his attention back when Brutus first approached him (*invenit insomni volventem publica cura | fata virum*, 2.239-240), and after his contemplations Cato now concludes that the *fata* are drawing him into participation in civil war (*quo fata trahunt virtus secura sequetur*).[9] He seems to imply that the act of dutifully following the *fata* offers

[8] For Lucan's consistent portrayal of *bellum civile* as *nefas* up to this point of the epic, cf. 1.6, 37, 626; 2.4. On this part of the speech, see Narducci (2002: 384-5).

[9] Cf. Brennan (2005: 235-41) for an overview of Stoic teachings on the concept of Fate and all the difficulties of interpretation that come with them. Ahl (1976: 240) notes that Lucan's use of *trahunt* seems

his character a kind of protective umbrella. Yet how could this be true for Cato when, as Brutus has rightfully pointed out, the *fata virum* are clearly drawing everyone else into a civil war whose *nefas* undermines and destroys *virtus*? Cato does acknowledge that his participation will incur guilt, a point on which he agrees with Brutus (*facient te bella nocentem*, 2.259), but he counters this by declaring that the *real* guilt lies with the nameless gods who decreed the *fata virum* to begin with. For his part, he says, he is just doing his duty which in this case *requires* him to get his hands dirty and ultimately pay the penalty of destruction that everybody involved must pay. This is a penalty that not even Cato can escape. Yet, he claims, his *virtus will* escape. The only way that Cato's *virtus* could remain *secura*—or perhaps even overcome the destructive grasp of civil war's *nefas*—would be if the *nature* of his participation were substantively different from others. And the only reason *fatum* would demand his participation at all would be if there were in fact something crucially important at stake. As we will see, this is precisely what Cato's speech sets out to show.

Two courses of action Cato wishes he could perform for the Respublica (289-319)

Over the remainder of this speech, Cato sets about unveiling and explaining the two areas in which the nature of his participation will be so unique. In so doing, he will also shed light on what is so important that it demands his participation. In chapters 2-4 I have illustrated that civil war's universality of defeat has up to this point subverted

---

to conflict with the saying of Cleanthes (given by Seneca *Ep*. 107.11) that the fates lead (*ducunt*) the willing but drag (*trahunt*) the unwilling; he admits that *trahunt* is metrically more convenient but argues that Lucan uses *trahunt* to say that Cato will follow the gods into war that will make Caesar the *victor*, but he does not approve of this outcome. Fantham (1992: 132) suggests Ovidian parallels for the formulation. Bartsch (1997: 120) on the other hand argues that the confusion of language is intentional by Lucan to illustrate that Cato though dragged against his will still maintains the illusion of the ability to choose freely. Cf. however Narducci (2002: 385) who states that this line is meant to "sottolineare il volontario autoinganno di Catone." See the nuanced treatment of Wildberger (2005: 61-3) on this passage with regard to Lucan's transformation of words that bear traditional Stoic meanings.

everything it touches. This means that Cato himself, if he participates, is doomed to defeat. Anything he would fight for is also doomed to defeat. There is nothing Cato or anyone can do to prevent this. What then can Cato hope to accomplish if defeat is assured? It means that his goal will *not* be to save himself or Rome from defeat. The way in which Cato uniquely approaches this defeat will rather show that not all defeats are made equal.

Commemorating the death of Roma and Libertas (289-303)

Cato's formulation of this first course of action is rhetorically an extension of his opening statement that his involvement is motivated by a sense of obligation. Expanding on the more general guiding forces of the *fata* and *virtus*, here in this next section Cato provides some more concrete examples that illustrate and defend this sense of obligation.

Involvement demanded by sense of public duty (289-297)

> sidera quis mundumque velit spectare cadentem
> expers ipse metus? quis, cum ruat arduus aether,
> terra labet mixto coeuntis pondere mundi,
> compressas tenuisse manus? gentesne furorem
> Hesperium ignotae Romanaque bella sequentur
> diductique fretis alio sub sidere reges,
> otia solus agam? procul hunc arcete pudorem,
> o superi, motura Dahas ut clade Getasque
> securo me Roma cadat.

> Who would want to watch the stars and the universe collapsing while he himself remained free from any fearful concern? Who, when the lofty skies come rushing down, when the earth crumbles to pieces under the collected weight of a universe collapsing upon itself, would want to keep his hands tightly clasped? When peoples unknown to us will follow our Hesperian madness and our Roman wars, and kings too separated from us by ocean shores under foreign skies, shall I alone conduct a life of leisure? Drive far away this source of shame, O gods, that Rome—she who, by her ruin, will move the Dahae and the Getae to action—should fall while I stood by *safe and secure*.

In a direct rebuttal of Brutus's claim that "it would be better to live a tranquil life of leisure, just like the stars of heaven always undisturbed" (*melius tranquilla sine armis | otia solus ages, sicut caelestia semper inconcussa…sidera*, 2.266-268), Cato counters by asking: who could possibly *want to feel and do nothing* while the world collapses around him?[10] He pushes aside Brutus's vision of civil war as being like a limited chaos in which "Olympus rises above the clouds" (*nubis excedit Olympus*, 2.271) to a view of civil war as a complete, universal collapse in which both the upper air (*arduus aether*) and the *terra* collide in absolute ruinous chaos (*cum ruat arduus aether, | terra labet mixto coeuntis pondere mundi*, 2.290-291), a scene that evokes the old Stoic concept of the *ekpyrosis*, the fiery self-annihilation of the universe at the end of the world.[11] All of this is posed by way of two rhetorical questions (2.289-292) that subtly but firmly change the terms of the question at issue from "non-participation" with its airy, attractive vocabulary of *tranquilla otia* to "refusal to participate" with its pointed, accusatory portrayal of a man refusing to lift a finger while the world collapses around him. As Cato asks, "Shall I alone remain at leisure?" (*otia solus agam?* 2.295), he directly echoes Brutus's vocabulary (*otia solus ages*, 2.267) while transforming the meaning of *otia* into something undesirable for the present situation. For Cato, neglecting to involve oneself in such a mighty conflict is now downright irresponsible, and the reason for this different stance is located in his recognition that the civil war and its outcome will have a direct

[10] Again, Lucan's use of *metus* as something that one apparently *should* possess here is less problematic than it may at first seem, for just as at 2.240 (*cunctisque timentem*) this kind of "fear" fits into the context more appropriately as a caring concern for others as opposed to the technical Stoic definition of "fear" as the irrational avoidance of a future event that one mistakenly thinks can really harm him. If this *metus* were the negative emotion as described by the Stoics, it would lead Cato to *avoid* participation and not lead him further into participation. Cf. Narducci (2002: 395).

[11] Cf. Lapidge (1979), Long and Sedley (1987: 274-9), Inwood and Gerson (1997: 155ff), Roche (2005: 59ff).

bearing upon everyone and everything included within its scope.[12] Lucan has his Cato correctly see that this conflict is no limited affair but is one so universal in scope that it will involve even such far-flung peoples as the Dahae and the Getae (2.296). Brutus wrongly believes that one actually *could* escape the conflict, but Cato recognizes the truth that there *is* no escape.[13] When the entire universe comes crashing down, you as part of that universe are already involved, whether you want to be or not. At one level then, part of what motivates Cato is his correct analysis of the real scope of this civil war's impact accompanied by his desire to live in accordance with *natura* and the *fata* that have led him into this conflict.

Cato, however, also puts forward a higher motivation than merely acceding to "what must be," for in this section of the speech we see a clear focus develop upon one's duty *as a Roman*. For Cato, speaking about "Rome" really means speaking about the Rome that will perish during the civil wars, for which reason I name it "Old Rome."[14] Historically speaking, this is of course the *Respublica* marked by Senatorial oversight that existed before the Caesars transformed the Roman state into the Principate. One striking feature of Lucan's narrative, however, is that the term *respublica* never once appears in the epic. Instead, the poet either names *Roma* directly or uses the phrase *res*

[12] Cf. George (1991: 242-3) who points out that in Roman stoicism, one could view the Roman Republic, at least in its ideal form, as "Zeno's ideal state in action…In such a state the wise man must participate." E.g. Cicero *De Rep*. 1.34.

[13] Cf. Tracy (2009) who systematically discusses the ways in which Lucan's epic closes off avenues of escape to everybody involved since the civil war ultimately takes on the cast of a cosmic upheaval.

[14] To be clear, I do not use "Old Rome" in any special theoretical sense but rather as a short form to indicate, from Lucan's perspective, the now-lost ideal of a pre-Caesarian Rome that exercised *libertas*. It is the loss of this *libertas* that seems to bother Lucan and his Cato the most.

Romanae.[15] Thus, for Lucan's Neronian audience, the *Bellum Civile* focuses in on "Rome" as an idea and identity rather than the *Respublica* as an historical system of government.[16] It is significant then that Cato here in this speech refers to the conflict specifically as *Romana bella*, drawing attention once again to what truly lies at the heart of this civil war. Through it all, we see that *Roma* herself is the central guiding motive for Cato's involvement.[17] Rome is about to perish, and by refusing to ignore this and by focusing his attention squarely upon her and her dying plight, Cato also focuses his readers' attention upon her. Part of Cato's role in this epic is thus this task of reminding us that Rome still matters. He helps to illustrate this when he asks whether it would be in any way right that he alone should stay uninvolved when Rome will move even foreign nations to action by her collapse. The centrality of Rome to the situation is further illustrated by her position as the nominative subject of the section's final clause, actively moving (*motura*) her objects to respond. He finally proclaims that there is no way he, as a Roman and a living *exemplum* of Roman virtue, can let himself suffer the shame of

---

[15] This phrase appears three times at 7.110 (*res Romanas*), 8.278 (*Romanis rebus*), and 9.253 (*Romanis rebus*). Lucan also uses *publica* as an adjective which can carry with it Republican associations (1.158, 2.239, 2.319, 7.51, 7.164, 9.249).

[16] This realization can perhaps shed some light on the long-held debate regarding what Lucan's political intentions were in composing this epic. George (1991: 245) surveys various Stoic views on good government during the Principate and discusses how such men as Seneca and Thrasea Paetus were happy to accommodate a *princeps* so long as he did not devolve into a tyrant; in contrast there existed a certain line of Roman Stoics (such as Helvidius Priscus) for whom "the choice would not have been between good king or bad king but between systems of government, a just Republic or a monarchy that would always degenerate into tyranny." For George, Cato (and thus Lucan himself) fall into this latter view in advocating a new Republic set free from tyranny. However, it remains a fact that the *Respublica* is absent in Lucan whereas *Roma* is literally all over the place. I do not think Lucan was as interested in restoring the Republic *per se*, which he readily admits in Book 1 had become hopelessly corrupt, so much as he was interested in resurrecting a powerful—if impressionistic—memory of the *Libertas* that this Old Rome possessed and which had been mostly forgotten since that time.

[17] Reydams-Schils (2005: 3) points out that "the Roman adaptation of originally Greek Stoic doctrine shows a distinctive pattern of emphasizing social responsibility." Even though I do not think that Lucan is trying to have his Cato adhere strictly to Stoic doctrine, it is still worth pointing out that a Roman Stoic who would choose public engagement could be seen as acting consistently within the trends of contemporary Stoicism so long as he perceived a genuine benefit to his virtue.

watching Rome—the foundation and source of what makes up his identity—fall while he himself remains *securus* (*procul hunc arcete pudorem | o superi…ut…| securo me Roma cadat*).[18]

What is especially noteworthy here at the end is the use of *securus*, because when viewed in contrast to its earlier use in the speech (2.287) it illustrates clearly one aspect of the unique nature of Cato's involvement. Cato begins by promising Brutus that his *virtus* can enter the world of civil war and remain *secura* (*sed quo fata trahunt virtus secura sequetur*, 2.287), but here at 2.297 he declares that *he himself* cannot enter civil war and remain *securus*. Cato admits that while *he* is doomed to defeat, the *exemplum* of his own life—the essence of the memory he has to offer—is not. If this power of memory can somehow rise above civil war's all-consuming destruction, it holds out the possibility that Cato's involvement could actually accomplish something for Rome, even when both he and she are to be defeated and destroyed by the civil war. In the next section, Cato points to just such a possibility.

Simile of a parent participating in his children's funeral procession (297-303)

> ceu morte parentem
> natorum orbatum longum producere funus
> ad tumulos iubet ipse dolor, iuvat ignibus atris
> inseruisse manus constructoque aggere busti
> ipsum atras tenuisse faces, non ante revellar
> exanimem quam te complectar, Roma; tuumque
> nomen, Libertas, et inanem persequar umbram.

> Just as grief itself bids a parent bereft by the death of his children to lead forth the long funeral procession to the burial mound—how good it feels to insert his hands into the black fires and, once the funeral pyre is built up, hold aloft the black torches himself—like this I will not be pulled

[18] I read *pudorem* suggested for the *furorem* in the mss; regardless, the overall sense still remains fairly constant, whether acting this way is shameful (*pudor*) or madness (*furor*).

> away before I embrace you, *Roma*, in your death, nor before I pursue your name, *Libertas*, and your empty shade.

As set forth above, the unique character of Cato's involvement is distinguished both by his motives for participating as well as by his response to defeat. Cato forcefully declares his motives in the closing words of this section: *Roma* and *Libertas*. These are the twin forces that move him to action, and taken together this ideal of a free Rome will stay central to Cato's actions in this epic.[19] With this declaration, Cato sets himself singularly apart, for everyone else involved has been shown to be guided by some other instinct, whether for self-preservation or selfish gain.[20] Yet if *Roma* and *Libertas* are doomed to be defeated and perish, it remains to be seen what Cato can hope to accomplish by getting involved in civil war on their behalf. In this speech, he proposes two courses of action that address this crucial question. The first proposed course of action provides a simple yet profound answer: he can *remember*. Spoken as an illustration of what is motivating him to become involved even in the face of certain defeat, Cato presents a funeral simile in which a grieving, bereaved father is driven to participate in the funeral procession of his recently deceased children. Although easy to overlook, I contend that this single funereal image is one of the most important passages in all of Lucan for understanding Cato's unique role in the epic.

---

[19] The rhetorical device of directly addressing them in the vocative (*quam te…Roma; tuumque nomen, Libertas*) drives home this point that his devotion for these two is what drives his involvement.

[20] Lucan's earlier description of the response in Rome to Caesar's approach shows how both patrician and plebeian alike, impelled by their fear for personal safety, abandoned Rome (1.484-509). Brutus too, as discussed above, admits that everybody but Cato is driven by their own self-focused reasons to participate in civil war (2.251-256). More significantly, he clearly stands out from the two other major characters. When Lucan introduces Pompey and Caesar early in Book 1, we see that a self-centered competition for honor and power motivates both of them: *nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarve priorem | Pompeiusve parem* (1.125-126).

Within this simile, Cato interprets his participation in the civil war as parallel to a grieving father's participation in the funeral of a deceased child. It is instructive to note that this scene hearkens back in many ways to the *Aeneid*'s most memorable image of a father mourning the death of his child when Evander grieves over Pallas as the funeral *pompa* carries the young man's body into the city (*Aeneid* 11.139-181).[21] Just as Evander is racked with so much *dolor* he can barely speak in the line immediately preceding the opening of his speech (*et via vix tandem voci laxata dolore est*, 11.151), so also *ipse dolor* drives the father in Cato's simile to participate. And like Evander, whose grief leads him to fling himself upon his son's dead body and embrace it (*procubuit super atque haeret lacrimansque gemensque*, 11.150), Cato—stepping out of the simile and speaking in his own voice—declares that he won't let himself be dragged away until he can embrace the lifeless body of *Roma* (*non ante revellar exanimem quam te complectar, Roma*). The context of this simile, coming as it does immediately after Cato's determined resolve not to sit idly by when even foreign nations are being moved to action, strongly suggests that the father—and thus Cato too—is moved by a natural and rational sense of duty combined with an even more natural and rational parental love.[22]

Before delving more deeply into this scene's larger significance, however, a further word should be said about the character of the passage's emotional dimension. The primacy of *dolor* here can at first glance seem to indicate that Cato is advocating his participation on grounds of being controlled by irrational emotion, a position hardly in

[21] This scene is itself but one of a string of scenes throughout the first part of Aeneid 11 dealing with funerals and/or mourning over the dead (11.1-224). As we will see below, the following scene (11.182–212) in which each side burns their dead on funeral pyres also serves as a Vergilian model for this part of Cato's speech.

[22] Cf. Reydams-Schils (2005: 141), who writes that "Human parenthood mirrors the divine care for the universe" within a Roman Stoic framework.

line with his traditionally accepted image as a Stoic *sapiens*.[23] As has already been discussed above, however, I do not think that Lucan has set out to propound a philosophical treatise in the guise of epic or a vast Stoic allegory.[24] This is rather a powerful, deeply moving epic that takes its cues from the grandeur of the *Aeneid* and the emotional power of the *Metamorphoses* among others. Lucan's Cato will be driven to grief in the face of the death of a loved one just as much as Evander in the face of the death of Pallas. The fact that Cato is mourning the coming death of Rome herself renders his reaction all the more understandable. It is thus generically appropriate that in the face of Rome's self-destruction Cato should be engaged emotionally, and vocabulary like *dolor* and *iuvat* are thus appropriate and natural—even expected—in response to this terrible situation.[25]

Furthermore, even if we were to assume a strict Stoic framework here—which I argue Lucan does not intend to invoke—there would still be room for *dolor* to be a legitimate response. As earlier with the use of *metus* (2.290), this *dolor* points to something broader than the technical meaning it has within the Stoic vocabulary of the emotions. In traditional Stoic doctrine, 'grief' (*dolor*) is a manifestation of 'pain' or

---

[23] The use of *iuvat* ("how good it feels…") in conjunction with *dolor* can also be seen to suggest an overwhelming emotion on Cato's part; cf. Fantham (1992: 134) who notes that *iuvat* is "the *vox propria* for passionate desire or its expression in speech" and cites some parallels, notably those of Dido in *Aeneid* 4.498 and 4.660.

[24] Ahl (1976) typically interprets Cato through a fairly rigid Stoic lens, but he does recognize that there need to be reasonable limits to this; on this scene he writes, "This passage should warn us that we will severely misconstrue Lucan's Cato if we regard him solely as a Stoic hero, more dedicated to pure philosophy than to political ideals" (244).

[25] Fantham (1992: 134) briefly sums up the situation: "Strictly speaking Cato's obedience to his grief is contrary to Stoic teaching which rejects such emotion, but neither epic nor tragedy can achieve any power without emotional involvment." Bartsch (1998: 116ff) is more nuanced in her analysis, recognizing the seeming inconsistencies of an emotional would-be Stoic but correctly acknowledging the consistency of Cato's portrayal within an epic that presents a narrator's voice that is even more emotional. Her ultimate conclusion, however, is that Lucan "produces two versions of the man, the one criticized, the other praised" (120), a position that I do not share.

'distress' (*aegritudo*), one of the four original classes of emotions (*pathe* or *turbatio*) that will be avoided by the true *sapiens* whose goal is what the Stoics called *apatheia*.[26] This does not promote a state "of total impassivity" but rather a response that is moderate and in concord with *natura*.[27] Since the technical Stoic definition of pain is the false (and thus irrational) opinion that "some present evil is of such a sort that we should be depressed about it," the *dolor* of the parent in the simile can only be a true Stoic emotion if it is excessive and based on a false opinion.[28] On the first criteria, it is instructive to consider that Seneca took a more practical stand in considering some amount of grieving in the face of death to be entirely appropriate provided that it is done in moderation.[29] Given that the simile comes as part of Cato's larger argument as to why he *should* participate, the simile itself suggests that such parental grief *is* in his view an entirely appropriate response.

---

[26] In the *Tusculanae Disputatationes*, Cicero lists *dolor* as an instance of *aegritudo* (4.7) and is subsequently defined as *dolor aegritudo crucians* (4.8). Cicero then goes on to cite the example of mourning over another's death as yet another manifestation (*luctus aegritudo ex eius, qui carus fuerit, interitu acerbo*, 4.8; cf. 3.24). Cicero in general makes no allowance in his presentation of Stoicism for grief, but as we will see shortly, Seneca does make some pragmatic allowance for grief in the Stoic system, a precedent in whose wake Lucan follows.

[27] Rist (1969: 25). The *sapiens* could and would feel bodily impressions that we would colloquially name "emotions" today, but so long as those impressions did not lead to judgments that were false and irrational a Stoic would not define properly them "emotions" as such. Cf. also Rist (1969: 45). On the Stoic conception of judgments made in accordance with *natura*, see Long (1986: 147ff).

[28] Brennan (2005: 93).

[29] This is in contrast to Cicero, cited above, who does not recognize any grief as appropriate for the proper Stoic. Seneca actually wrote two formal *Consolationes* (*ad Helviam* and *ad Marciam*), the latter of which is specifically addressed to a mother who has lost her child, making him a particularly useful source for comparison. Seneca consistently advocates for moderate grief in such circumstances as appropriate and natural, [e.g. *ad Marciam* 4.1, 7.1; *Ep*. 18.4-5]. Reydams-Schils (2005: 134-41), provides an insightful discussion of Seneca's moderating position toward parental grief, noting that for Seneca, "Not grief itself but an excessive expression of this emotion turns out to be the problem" (136). Cato's grief—like that of the father in the simile—would not be excessive so long as it is a natural response and is not based on a false opinion of the situation. The Stoics did acknowledge rational beliefs that would fall within what would colloquially today be called emotions; these positive "emotions" were known as *eupatheiai* and were categorized as caution, joy, and volition; cf. Brennan (2005: 97ff). Reydams-Schils (2005: 138-9) offers the intriguing possibility that Seneca makes allowance for a kind of "natural grief" as the fourth *eupatheiai* so that grief too might have its positive counterpart.

One might suggest that the possibility that Cato is being led astray by false opinion, which would paint a negative view of Cato in this passage. If this were the case, however, Lucan would be casting Cato in a negative light for what Lucan has himself already done in the proem when the narrator responds to the theme of the epic with an emotional outpouring of grief, exemplified by the searing question: *quis furor o cives, quae tanta licentia ferri?* (1.8).[30] Such a self-negating position does not seem at all likely. Part of the solution is to acknowledge that Lucan here is likely being a bit free with his emotive vocabulary, following the path laid by his epic predecessors.[31] In any event, the point of the passage as a whole rhetorically is to help reveal something about the nature and motivation behind Cato's participation. Read in this context, the emotional language helps the reader understand that Cato is not participating in a detached state devoid of any real feeling but is involving himself because, just like the bereaved parent, he *genuinely cares*.[32]

---

[30] I recognize that the voice of Lucan's internal narrator does not necessarily have to reflect the historical Lucan's viewpoints, and also that Lucan's text seems intentionally inconsistent for poetic effects; cf. O'Hara (2007). It seems self-evident, however, that Lucan would not have been *so* inconsistent as to embed in his proem a programmatic outlook on the evil of civil war that he then intended his readers to recognize as invalid for the rest of the epic.

[31] Yet Lucan would have known that such a key word like *dolor* would also resonate with its traditional Stoic meaning as one of the ***pathe***, and its use in this context hints at the intriguing possibility that Lucan is suggesting an addendum to the Stoic doctrine of the emotions by arguing that *dolor* in this case would not be a false impression at all (and thus not a true Stoic ***pathos***) because the death of *Roma* is in fact not an indifferent at all but is *truly harmful* for everybody involved.

[32] It is also true that the Romans infused Stoicism with an emphasis on civic involvement, what Reydams-Schils (2005: 3) calls "a distinctive pattern of emphasizing social responsibility." This can help us understand why we should in fact expect Cato in fact to become involved. Regarding the striking emotive vocabulary Lucan assigns to Cato both here and later in Book 9, Behr (2007: 113-61) argues convincingly that Cato is *in fact* the very figure Lucan uses to engage the emotions of his readers most effectively. Her study illustrates ways in which Lucan assigns Cato the positions that appear closest to those held by the poet himself; the use of emotional language and direct narrator appeal in conjunction with Cato thus helps the reader enter a mode of emotional engagement rather than disaffection, so that we as the audience of this epic are guided also genuinely to care.

Lucan's use of the emotionally charged *dolor* also serves to recall the word's notable appearance in the *previous* funeral simile located at the beginning of Book 2 (2.21-28). Through this verbal echo, Lucan offers an interpretive context for the present simile, and a comparison of the two will help illuminate what separates the unique nature of Cato's response from that of his fellow Romans. Lucan actually uses *dolor* no less than four times in the opening lines of Book 2 to characterize the response of the Roman people to their impending defeat (2.21, 27, 39, 42). The first of these instances is what actually triggers the funeral simile (*magnusque per omnis | erravit sine voce dolor. sic funere primo*…, 2.20-21), and Lucan's description of a *magnus dolor* in the nominative that runs rampant as its own active agent mirrors the *ipse dolor* that commands the father in Cato's simile to act. Furthermore, the focus in both scenes is upon the parent (*mater* at 2.23 vs. *parentem* at 2.297), specifically their response to the death of the child.[33] There is finally the presence of *exanimis* in both scenes; in the earlier simile it describes the *vultusque exanimes* (2.26) of the deceased child, whereas in this scene it appears in reference to Rome which Cato promises to embrace even in death (*non ante reuellar | exanimem quam te complectar, Roma*, 2.301-302).

It is at this point, however, that the similarities between the two funeral similes end. One difference is that the mother in the earlier simile stands in for the people of Rome as they respond in fear and grief to *their own* impending doom, whereas the parent in the later scene represents Cato who, as we have seen, fears not for himself but for others. But even more significantly, there is a temporal distinction between the two similes. The earlier scene is set right at the moment of death when, as Lucan states,

[33] While the earlier simile does not specifically name the deceased as a child, the centrality of the *mater* naturally suggests a child, as the "grieving mother" is a standard trope.

necdum est ille dolor nec iam metus (2.27); the mother is on the threshold between fear of impending death and grief at its arrival, and no attempt has yet been made to memorialize the dead. In contrast, Cato's simile takes place later in the sequence of events, for it presents the funeral procession that is driven by the *dolor* once it has taken full hold. The later scene may thus be viewed in one sense as a kind of sequel or continuation of the earlier simile—yet it stands only as a *possible* development. We see from Cato's funeral simile that the enactment of memory to preserve that which has died in the hearts and minds of the community is not assured, for it relies upon how one chooses to respond to such a death. As Lucan shows us, the nature of the grief response that comes out of each scene presents a complete contrast.

The most crucial and significant distinction that emerges between these divergent responses is the extent to which each is able to produce something productive and beneficial out of the terrible situation. As already discussed above in Chapter 3, the narrative that follows the earlier simile shows how the people of *Roma*—represented in turn by the city's matrons, the military-age men, and the elderly—can only respond impotently by bemoaning their fates as they try in vain to rescue themselves from the crushing grasp of impending defeat. Nothing is in fact accomplished. The *matronae*, whom Lucan characterizes as *attonitae* or "thunderstruck" (*lacerasque in limine sacro | attonitae fudere comas*, 2.31-32), seem only able to go so far as to make tearful—and futile—pleas at the altars of the gods (2.29-36), showing that theirs is a *dolor* that can produce only a state of dazed inaction.[34] It is appropriate then that Lucan summarizes the

[34] That the *matronae* are *attonitae* is significant because it explicitly connects their situation with the preceding funeral simile in which Lucan described the stricken household also as *attonitae* (*sic funere primo | attonitae tacuere domus*, 2.21-22). The verbal parallel is made even clearer by the fact that the

end product of their response by concluding that "by these stings, Grief goaded itself into a frenzy" (*his se stimulis dolor ipse lacessit*, 2.42); this grief notably attacks itself, mirroring the self-destructive power of civil war.[35] In a similar fashion, the men leaving for opposing camps—speaking for the last time with a unified voice—are only able to utter ineffectual complaints about the coming doom of civil war before marching off to enact that war themselves, complaints characterized as expressions of *pietas peritura* (2.63). Finally, all that the old men who are staying behind can accomplish in this situation is resurrect old memories of civil war's promised destruction whose ultimate effect, as we have already seen, is summed up by Lucan as the end of the flashback to Marius and Sulla: *sic maesta senectus | praeteritique memor flebat metuensque futuri* (2.232-234). The old men's grief-driven act of commemoration (*praeteriti memor*) proves impotent and leads only to further fear (*metuens futuri*), feeding the self-destructive cycle seen throughout the whole section.

The unique nature of Cato's participation comes through most clearly in Cato's closing words to this section where he expresses his desire both to embrace a defeated, lifeless *Roma* (*exanimem…te complectar, Roma*) and to follow in the footsteps of the empty shade of the name of *Libertas* (*tuumque nomen, Libertas, et inanem persequar umbram*).[36] *Roma* and *Libertas* are revealed as the true victims of civil war and become

---

word *attonitae* appears exactly ten lines apart and in both instances appears at the front of an enjambed line followed by two more words to complete the phrase.

[35] Recall what Lucan said of the fleeing Romans earlier at 1.503: *naufragium sibi quisque facit*.

[36] Housman and Shackleton-Bailey prefer the consensus reading *persequar* "with its stronger force of following *into* death" to the "more ordinary" variant *prosequar*.

the objects of Cato's devotion that ultimately motivate his participation.[37] To punctuate his determination, he declares that he won't be pulled away (*non ante revellar…quam*) from their figurative funeral pyre until he is able to embrace them and follow in their tread. It is this formulation by Cato more than any other that defines what I call 'Old Rome' in the epic, namely the Rome that existed before the advent of the Caesars, a Rome who must be remembered lest it be forgotten. Through this image of a father attending a child's funeral, Lucan invites us to read his Cato as Rome's true *pater patriae*.[38] In this way Lucan places Cato and what he will memorialize opposite both to *pius* Aeneas, the epic ancestor of the Caesars, as well as the Caesars themselves.

This functions not only as a statement of the depth of Cato's devotion but also of his dedication to memory.[39] In other words, Cato uses the funeral simile to illustrate his desire to remember an event of death and destruction. This much he shares in common with the old men of the city, but Cato's actions in this regard are properly guided by a duty to commemorate, and thus in a sense *preserve*, what is in imminent danger of being lost. As discussed in previous chapters, a funeral memorial helps create a living memory of the dead so that the deceased, through that power of memory, can continue to exert a beneficial influence upon the living. In this light, Cato's goal to memorialize the ideal of a free Rome is the very work of *pietas*. The poet's characterization of the preceding

---

[37] Cf. George (1991: 246, 253) who recognizes that Cato's speech helps point to the death of *Libertas* as a central, defining feature in the epic. Lebek (1976: 185) calls this formulation of *Roma* and *Libertas* the *Hauptthema* of the speech.

[38] Later in Book 9, after Cato reassembles Pompey's defeated armies in Africa and convinces them to fight no longer for a leader but for Rome herself, Lucan in fact explicitly addresses him as *ecce parens verus patriae* (9.604). Cf. Behr (2007: 130) who draws attention to this connection.

[39] In this way Lucan has Cato affirm for himself his identification with the defeated side that first appears at 1.128 (*sed victa Catoni*). The context of this speech confirms that the *victa causa* of 1.128, at least as far as Cato is concerned, is not Pompey's faction but the identity of *Roma* herself.

men's complaints as *pietas peritura* helps confirms the depth of the contrast, for in Cato alone we find the first character in the epic who will earnestly work to uphold *pietas* and memory rather than undermine it.

Lucan here is drawing directly upon a Vergilian model, the funeral scene in *Aeneid* 11.182–212 when the two opposed armies of Trojans and Rutulians agree to a cease-fire in order to gather their respective dead and burn them upon the battlefield.[40] Like Lucan, Vergil also presents a clear contrast between each side's respective responses to the deaths of their loved ones. We first see the actions of Aeneas and the Trojans, whose conduct in this grim business of burning their dead is visibly marked by planned order and sincere devotion to the memory of the departed. Aeneas himself personally takes a hand in the construction of the pyres (*iam pater Aeneas, iam curvo in litore Tarchon | constituere pyras*, 11.184-185), much like the father in Cato's simile who reaches his own hands into the pyre and holds aloft the funeral torches (*iuvat ignibus atris inseruisse manus…ipsum atras tenuisse faces*). For the Trojans, each step in the process is carried out with proper deliberation, beginning with the laying out of the bodies—notably, in the custom of their forefathers (*more suorum partum*, 11.185-186), illustrating the proper importance of *pietas* in these *funera*. This is then followed by three circuits of the pyres by men on horseback, accompanied by proper cries of mourning and the blasts of trumpets (11.188-192), followed in turn by the placing of the spoils of the enemy upon the fires, the sacrificing of burnt offerings (11.193-199). The culmination of their funeral observances comes when the Trojans respectfully watch their

[40] This scene in fact follows directly upon the scene discussed above in which Evander mourns the death of Pallas (*Aeneid* 11.139-181). Cf. Erasmo (2008: 87-91) who discusses this Vergilian episode in the wider context of depictions of burials in Latin epic.

dead comrades burn on the pyres, keeping guard over the memorials, throughout the entire night (*ardentis spectant socios semustaque servant | busta*), 11.200-201).

Though the Rutulians also set about erecting funeral pyres (*nec minus et miseri diversa in parte Latini | innumeras struxere pyras*, 11.203-205), their funerals are marked not by any unified order and *pietas* but by a general chaos. Despite the fact that pyres have been made, some of the dead are buried (*corpora partim | multa virum terrae infodiunt*, 11.204-205), some are inexplicably moved to adjacent fields (*avectaque partim | finitimos tollunt in agros*, 11.205-206), while others are carried back to the city (*urbique remittunt*, 11.206). All the rest are in fact burned on their pyres but in such a confused, anonymous heap of dead bodies that none of the deceased can be singled out or given individual honors (*cetera confusaeque ingentem caedis acervum | nec numero nec honore cremant*, 11.207-208). The memorializing impulse is present but fails to achieve its purpose in the absence of properly observed *funera*. *Pietas* is not upheld, and the dead are effectively rendered anonymous and quickly fade into oblivion.

It is in light of this looming danger that Cato thrusts himself into the civil war in the role of the leader of a funeral procession for *Roma et Libertas*, whom he identifies as the true victims of the civil war. In the preceding sections, Cato's fellow Romans share with Vergil's Rutulians the inability to maintain the survival of *pietas* and properly memorialize their dead. Cato by contrast declares his intent to act in a way that recalls the Trojans, whose devotion to the dead and to their task of memorializing is so great that, as Vergil explains "they cannot be wrenched away" from watching the pyres burn down until the night is nearly over (*neque avelli possunt, nox umida donec | invertit caelum stellis ardentibus aptum*, 11.201-202). Thus they succeed both in upholding

pietas and in memorializing their dead. Working from this model, Cato likewise declares that he will not let himself be "wrenched away" until he embraces a lifeless Roma (*non ante revellar exanimem quam te complectar*). The thematic and verbal parallels (especially Cato's *avelli* for the Trojans' *revellar*) reveal that Cato is claiming for himself the same purpose.

A serious problem remains, however, to be considered. When Cato declares that he is pursuing a *Libertas* that is by this time *inanis*, at first glance he appears to admit there is not enough left that could be truly commemorated and preserved, or that once preserved the memory would be but an impotent memory.[41] Far from an admission to the hopelessness and impossibility of his task, however, I argue that Cato's use of *inanis* is a recognition of its very need to be commemorated. In short, *Libertas* is "empty" precisely because it is in imminent danger of being abandoned and forgotten. In terms of memory, the greatest emptiness is that found in the looming voids of *oblivio*. Cato thus acknowledges the real danger to the survival of *Roma* and *Libertas*. In this speech he concedes that they will be defeated but illustrates by way of the funeral simile that such defeat does *not* need to be the end of the story. They may be *inanes* now, but Cato does not intend for them to remain mere empty shades forever.[42] It is precisely the act of commemorating that imbues the dead with continued meaning, and Lucan's Cato

---

[41] Elsewhere in Lucan, *inanis* usually indicates the standard meanings of "empty" or "in vain" (e.g. the *frustra leges et inania iura* of 2.316 in the next part of Cato's speech), and the standard interpretation of the word here assumes that by it Cato is admitting that *Libertas* is indeed past any hope of recovery. Fantham (1992: 135), writes that *inanis* indicates how "moral values have become hollow or ineffectual." I would argue, however, that Lucan connects the concept of "*inanis*" with death, which presents the possibility at least of subsequent commemoration and revitalization of the dead. In other word, moral values are in constant danger of being and staying "hollow and innfectual" but they need not necessarily stay that way.

[42] See Chapter 7 for more discussion on the meaning of *inanis*, particularly in connection with the reappearance of Pompey's supposedly *inanis umbra* which yet proves surprisingly capable of continued action and influence even after death.

proposes to the one out in front carrying their funeral torch. The profound contrast that separates Cato from those around him at last comes into clear view. Unlike the preceding spoken memorial of past defeat (2.232-234) that only continues the cycle of fear and self-defeat, Cato's image of a memorializing funeral procession holds the power—and the promise—to *revitalize* what has been lost. This is the unique nature of Cato's response to defeat, to harness the power of memory in the very midst of defeat to accomplish something beneficial, something that has the real potential to transcend the universal defeat promised by civil war. Lucan's Cato holds out the hope that from the ashes of defeat can still emerge a victory of memory.

**Saving Roma by enacting a *devotio*
on her behalf (304-319)**

Having set forth his desire to revive the defeated ideal of a free Rome (*Roma* and *Libertas*) through the power of memory, Cato now lays out his second desired course of action by suggesting a model for how his own coming defeat can also prove beneficial to the *patria*.

Admission of Roma's need to pay for its crimes (304-307)

> sic eat: immites Romana piacula divi
> plena ferant, nullo fraudemus sanguine bellum.
> o utinam caelique deis Erebique liceret
> hoc caput in cunctas damnatum exponere poenas!

> So be it! Let the ruthless gods have their Roman *piacula* in full, let us not cheat this war of a single drop of blood! O would that it were possible to set forth *this* head as the one to pay all the penalties owed to the gods both above and below!

With the dramatic "So be it!" Cato signals the start of the speech's second half and identifies his determination to follow *Roma et Libertas* even into defeat as the point

of connection that links the two halves.[43] He knows that the pursuit of this path will ensure his own defeat, and here in this second half of the speech he turns his attention to the possibility of rendering his now-inevitable defeat into something that can be in some way beneficial to those who live on after him. Put another way, Cato wishes he could transform his own defeat into a kind of victory for Rome.

Cato begins this line of thinking by admitting that the Roman people past and present have committed crimes that need repayment through *piacula*. Within Lucan's epic, two distinguishable sources for such guilt emerge. The first, more general source is the series of crimes that Rome inflicted upon herself (*tu causa malorum...Roma*, 1.84-85), both because of the tyrannical First Triumvirate (1.84-93) and because of her people's corruption and abandonment of justice and traditional morality (1.158-182). The second source of guilt is more specific and, for our purposes, more resonant: the shades of the defeated Carthaginians now vengefully demand repayment in blood. This idea, which is found in Lucan right away in the proem (*diros Pharsalia campos | impleat et Poeni saturentur sanguine manes*, 1.38-39), is part of an established tradition of interpreting the civil wars that goes back at least to Horace.[44]

---

[43] Cf. Fantham (1992: 135), who notes through parallels that "*Sic eat!*" is indicative of one acquiescing to what is willed by Fate.

[44] For a basic outline of this theme both in Lucan and other Roman authors up to his time, see Ahl (1976: 82ff). Horace presents the idea most clearly at *Odes* 2.1.25-28 where he specifically notes the irony of the descendants of the *victores* as the ones who, by their own death through the civil wars, will avenge the *victi*: *Iuno et deorum quisquis amicior | Afris inulta cesserat impotens | tellure, victorum nepotes | rettulit inferias Iugurthae*. Lucan picks up this notion of the need to placate the defeated African shades more explicitly at 6.309-311 in discussing what could have been avoided if Pompey had only defeated Caesar once and for all at Dyrrhachium: *nec Iuba Marmaricas nudus pressisset harenas | Poenorumque umbras placasset sanguine fuso | Scipio, nec sancto caruisset vita Catone*. This theme undoubtedly was particularly attractive and useful to Lucan, both in its subversion of the winner by the defeated party as well as in its potential for drawing a geographical connection between the *post-mortem* influence of the African dead and Cato's own looming death in Utica.

Indeed, the whole point of all of the portents and prophecies that close out Book 1 is to confirm the anger of the gods and inevitability of Rome's defeat in the coming civil wars (*iamque irae patuere deum manifestaque belli | signa dedit mundus*, 2.1-2). What these dire signs also confirm, however, is the specific manner in which the Roman debt to the gods and the African shades will be repaid. Figulus the astrologer, sums up his findings by proclaiming that divine anger has promised the *nefas* of *bellum civile* (1.666-672). The Roman blood to be shed is doomed to come from the hands of fellow Romans. While every *piaculum* requires some form of sacrifice, Rome is destined to engage in civil war, which in the context of a *piaculum* becomes a gruesome *self-sacrifice*.[45] Cato acknowledges that a sacrificial offering must be made (*nullo fraudemus sanguine bellum*), and his anguish stems from the realization that not only is Rome doomed to perish but this must be by its own self-destructive hand.

Since Rome must engage in self-sacrifice, Cato offers the striking notion that perhaps he could substitute *himself* individually in place of the collective Roman people as the entity who will commit the required self-sacrifice: *o utinam caelique deis Erebique liceret | hoc caput in cunctas damnatum exponere poenas*. If only, so his thinking goes, he could place the penalties of all upon his own head and appease the gods above and below, then Rome could be saved and the civil wars could be averted. *If only*. Cato's use of *utinam* seems to stand as his admission that such a substitution is not really possible, no matter how attractive it may seem or how much Cato wishes he could do it.[46] As

[45] For the conceptualization of civil war as a self-inflicted defeat, see Chapter 2. Cf. Horace *Epode* 7.9-10: *sua | urbs haec periret dextera*.

[46] Fantham (1992: 135): "Cato acknowledges…that he cannot by sacrificing his single life atone for all the sins of Rome and ransom her allies from the necessity of evil killing (312-13)."

discussed in the previous chapters, everything in the epic up to this point has confirmed that this world of civil war promises universal defeat to everything it touches, and nothing Cato can do at this point can save the Roman people from suffering their fated, self-inflicted defeat. In this light, one might wonder what purpose Cato can really have in this story.[47]

Yet, if Cato is truly mired in a dead end with nothing further that he can do, we ought to ask why Lucan has him spend the latter half of his speech essentially contemplating this course of action that seems impossible. The answer lies, I argue, in the potential that the model of the "beneficial self-sacrifice" offers to Cato. It is worth remembering that Cato was first introduced by name as a figure whose identity lay with the defeated side (*sed victa Catoni*, 1.128). From the very beginning of the epic, his role never had anything to do with saving people from defeat, but rather with holding out the potential for transforming the very meaning of defeat. As we move into the rest of his speech, we will see that the model of the beneficial self-sacrifice will offer Cato the best means by which he can hope to accomplish this.

Devotio *as model for Cato's beneficial self-sacrifice (308-311)*

> devotum hostiles Decium pressere catervae:
> me geminae figant acies, me barbara telis
> Rheni turba petat, cunctis ego pervius hastis
> excipiam medius totius vulnera belli.

[47] Fantham (1992: 135) concludes that Cato spends most of this section talking about what he cannot change in order to emphasize the uniqueness of his position as the one who genuinely does care about the laws and about freedom from tyranny, and "Thus Cato decides to take part, not in hope of a just peace, or the triumph of liberty, but in recognition that the gods have determined on the collective slaughter of Romans by Romans, and that his own blood is owed to them (304-5)." It is true that Cato is not motivated by a false hope for bringing about peace or restoring the laws and liberty, but this view strips Cato of the ability to do anything at all other than acquiesce to Fate and in defeat surrender his blood which the gods demand—in short, Cato can *die well*, but that is all. What Fantham and others overlook is the applicability of the model of the beneficial self-sacrifice to somebody in Cato's position, as discussed below.

> Enemy throngs overwhelmed Decius during his *devotio*—let the twin armies pierce *me*, let the barbarian mob from the Rhine seek *me* out with their javelins, let me stand in the center to block all the spears and receive myself all the wounds of this war.

Having introduced the concept of the *piaculum*, or substitutionary sacrifice, along with his desire to become one himself on behalf of the *populus Romanus*, Cato names a single—but powerful—*exemplum* to illustrate the model: the famous *devotio* of Publius Decius Mus. The concept of the *devotio* is described well by Andrew Feldherr as:

> "a drastic measure in which a magistrate with imperium, consul, dictator, or praetor, to prevent imminent defeat consecrates one individual, who thus takes upon himself the impurities of the entire state. This individual then charges into the midst of the enemy, presumably to his death, and by this act ensures their destruction."[48]

In simplest terms, the *devotio* ritual allowed a commander to ensure victory through performing an action that assures his own defeat.[49] It was such an extreme and rare action that the Roman historical tradition only recorded two certain instances of this kind of *devotio* taking place, curiously enough by two people both named Publius Decius Mus, father and son. Both men perished in similar circumstances (340 and 295 BC respectively) and in such memorable fashion that the Decii had become by Cicero's time one of the standard *exempla* of Roman patriotism and self-sacrifice.[50] It is worth

---

[48] Feldherr (1998: 85).

[49] The main studies on the Roman *devotio* are those of Versnel (1976, also 1980) and Janssen (1981); much of the scholarly debate centers around the origin and real-world significance of the ritual act, not over its significance in literature. On the *devotio* in Livy, see esp. Feldherr (1998: 85-92).

[50] Cicero cites the Decii the most of any ancient author (e.g. *De Fin.* 2.61, 5.64; *Pro Sestio* 48, 143; *De Div.* 1.51; *De Senec*. 43, 75; *Tusc. Disp*. 1.89, 2.59; *De Off*. 1.61, 3.16; *De Nat. Deorum* 2.10, 3.15), but they also appear elsewhere in Roman literature (Val. Max. 1.7.3; Pliny *Nat. Hist*. 28.12; Florus 1.9.2, 1.12.19). They are most often invoked as *exempla* of patriotism (Cic. *De Fin*. 2.61, *se victimam rei publicae praebuisset*), piety (Val. Max. 5.6.5-6 cites both of them in his section on *pietas*), and bravely facing death without fear (Cic. *De Sen*. 75, *ad voluntariam mortem cursum equorum incitaverunt*). Cicero on a few occasions (*Tusc. Disp.* 1.37, 2.19) also says that a third Decius, consul in 279 BC, sacrificed himself too to assure victory for his army by means of a *devotio* ritual while fighting against the armies of Pyrrhus. No other historical source, however, suggests that his death during the campaign was from any other than

revisiting the story here in order to understand better why Cato (and thus Lucan) would choose *this* particular *exemplum* as the one he most wishes he could emulate.[51]

Livy provides the fullest treatment of these events in his account of the death of the first Decius (8.6.9-8.10.10).[52] The story begins on the eve of the Battle of Veseris (340 BC), as the Roman army under the consuls Publius Decius Mus and Titus Manlius Torquatus prepare to do battle against a confederation of Latins near the foot of Vesuvius. During the still of night while the consuls slept, both men are mysteriously visited by the same vision of a figure "of greater and more majestic appearance than a mere human" (*species viri maioris quam pro humano habitu augustiorisque*, 8.6.9). This apparition proceeds to offer the dire declaration that in the fight to come, due to the wrath of the gods, the commander of one side and the army of the other are owed to the Manes and Mother Earth (*ex una acie imperatorem, ex altera exercitum Deis Manibus Matrique Terrae deberi*, 8.6.10). The figure thus concludes with the formula for victory: the commander who devotes unto the gods the opposing army to death—and himself along with them—will be the one who secures the victory for his side (*utrius exercitus imperator legions hostium superque eas se devovisset, eius populi partisque victoriam fore* (8.6.10). Armed with this crucial knowledge of how to ensure victory, the two consuls decide that whichever side of the battle line shows the first signs of collapsing, the commander in charge of that flank will enact the *devotio*. When the battle is engaged,

---

normal combat experiences. Indeed, Cicero's appropriation of the *Decius devotus* model onto a third Decius illustrates the evocative power of this *exemplum* upon the Roman mind.

[51] On the influence of the *devotio* image in several episodes in the *Bellum Civile*, see Leigh (1997: 128-43).

[52] No other full narrative of the events surrounding the *devotio* of either Decius survives. I will limit my analysis to Livy's account of the first Decius, primarily because his telling of the death of the second Decius (10.28.1-10.29.20) provides few details on the actual act of *devotio* and in any case is clearly modeled upon the earlier story.

it so happens that the Roman left flank, of which Decius is in charge, starts to falter first, upon which he decides to invoke the gods' help in securing the victory. With the assistance of an attendant *pontifex*, Decius Mus performs the proper rituals, invokes the gods above and below with an appropriate prayer, mounts his horse, and plunges headlong into the advancing enemy lines.

Livy's dramatic description of this moment crystallizes for his readers both the significance of the act as the turning point of the battle as well as the image of *Decius devotus* as a unique figure in the conflict. Despite the chaos of the battlefield, as if the action suddenly freezes, Decius is suddenly in clear view of all the participants in the battle (*conspectus ab utraque acie*, 8.9.10), as he in fact transformed into a figure—like the original nighttime apparition—"a great deal more majestic in appearance than a mere human" (*aliquanto augustior humano visu*, 8.9.10). This works to render Decius "as if sent from heaven as a *piaculum* for all the gods' anger" and as someone "who would turn this destruction away from his own people and toward the enemy" (*sicut caelo missus piaculum omnis deorum irae, qui pestem ab suis aversam in hostes ferret*, 8.9.10).

The effect, Livy writes, is immediate, as a sudden *terror pavorque* (8.9.11) throws the Latins into wholesale confusion such that wherever he goes, "men tremble as if beaten down by a baleful star" (*ibi haud secus quam pestifero sidere icti pavebant*, 8.9.12). Decius finally falls under a hail of missiles, but we read how from that moment onward the Latins—instead of gaining courage in their defeat of the Roman general—begin fleeing the battlefield all along their lines in shocked consternation (*ubi vero corruit obrutus telis, inde iam haud dubie consternatae cohortes Latinorum fugam ac vastitatem late fecerunt*, 8.9.12). Livy makes it clear that in fulfillment of the prophetic

message given to the consuls, the Latins' would-be moment of victory is precisely the moment at which their defeat is assured. Accordingly, the reinvigorated Roman army pushes back the Latins, and after some resistance on the right flank, the Latin line breaks and the Romans secure the victory that Decius's self-sacrifice first made certain. In the aftermath, the body of Decius is given a fitting burial (8.10.10) by his colleague and properly commemorated with all honor and glory due the name of someone who, as Livy puts it, "turned all the threats and dangers from the gods above and below toward himself alone" (*omnes minas periculaque ab deis superis inferisque in se unum vertit*, 8.10.7) and so saved the Roman people.

By analyzing Livy's account of Decius's *devotio* we can better see why this story proved so attractive to Lucan's Cato as a model. Above all, it represents the greatest paradigm in Roman history of someone destined for defeat who used that defeat as the means to ensure victory.[53] The extent and significance of the similarities between Decius and Cato and their respective situations go much deeper, however, and suggest that the *exemplum* of Decius is indeed as the only fitting model. To begin with, Publius Decius Mus stands as one of the supreme examples of Roman virtue and patriotism, for in him we find a Roman leader who placed nothing else, not even his own life, above the continued welfare and honor of *Roma* herself.[54] Cato thus finds in him a man who

---

[53] Valerius Maximus (5.6.5) brings up the elder Decius as an example of those patriotic Romans who put the *patria* before personal safety: *caput suum pro salute rei publicae devovit, ac protinus concitato equo in medium hostium agmen, patriae salutem, sibi mortem petens, irrupit, factaque ingenti strage plurimis telis obrutus super corruit. ex cuius vulneribus et sanguine insperata Victoria emersit*. This closing image of "Victory unhoped-for springing forth from wounds and blood" is a particularly apt one for Cato's overall goal in this civil war.

[54] Cf. Versnel (1976: 365): "For many centuries the Decii were considered the typical example of patriotism and self-sacrifice. Even St. Augustine [*CD* 5.18] still mentions them with esteem. It is understandable that, when Romans heard the term *devotio*, they at once were reminded of the most illustrious example." Valerius Maximus, for example, reserves a place for Decius Mus in his section on

mirrored his own purpose, for Cato too has decided that he will spare nothing in his pursuit of *Roma* and *Libertas*.[55] Cato could also find in the Decius story a situation that mirrored his own, namely the prospect of imminent defeat. The *devotio* only arises as a final option when defeat of the Roman people otherwise appears certain, which is precisely the point at which Cato, along with the rest of the Roman people, finds himself.[56] A third similarity that stands out is also one of situation, for Livy explicitly describes the battle of Veseris in which Decius enacts his *devotio* as something *especially like a civil war* (*fuit autem civili maxime bello pugna similis*, 8.8.2). The Latins were similar to the Roman army in language, customs, and armament, their military institutions were set up in very much the same fashion, and on top of that many of the soldiers now on opposing sides had previously served side by side in other campaigns and knew each other well (8.6.15).[57]

---

pietas towards ones parents or country: *caput suum pro salute rei publicae devovit, ac protinus concitato equo in medium hostium agmen, patriae salutem, sibi mortem petens, irrupit, factaque ingenti strage plurimis telis obrutus super corruit. ex cuius vulneribus et sanguine insperata victoria emersit* (5.6.5). It is for this reason that Vergil includes Decius in his parade of Roman heroes in *Aeneid* 6, notably in the context of those who exhibit *amor patriae* (6.823-824).

[55] Indeed, the words that Lucan used to describe Cato when Brutus came to him at the beginning of this episode could just as easily describe Decius Mus: "*Him* he finds wide awake, pondering with never-resting care the concerns of the state, the dooms of men, and the destruction of the City, fearing for all others yet at peace regarding himself" (*insomni volventem publica cura | fata virum casusque urbis cunctisque timentem | securumque sui*, 2.239-241).

[56] Versnel (1980: 140): "The situation that induced the sacrifice of the Roman general is marked as a critical vicissitude during the war: defeat and disaster are imminent both in the present case and in the stories of the other Decii and their *devotio*." Cf. also Versnel (1976: 365).

[57] Livy 8.6.15: *curam acuebat quod adversus Latinos bellandum erat lingua, moribus, armorum genere, institutis ante omnia militaribus, congruentes; milites militibus, centurionibus centurions, tribuni tribunis compares collegaeque iisdem in praesidiis, saepe iisdem manipulis permixti fuerant.* Later at 8.8.14, Livy notes how the Latins set up their battle formation opposite the Romans in the same way (*eodemque ordine instruxerant aciem*), which leads to a comment on how two centurions who knew each other quite well (*notissimi inter se*, 8.8.17) faced off against each other. In microcosm of the battle as a whole, the Roman centurion who is older and more experienced but no longer a strong warrior finds a substitute *subcenturio* to fight for him; the Roman is victorious and the Latin is defeated. In this scene Livy celebrates the triumph of the Romans but also hints at the civil wars waged more recent to his own time.

Seen in this light, the Decius *exemplum* would seem indeed to be the perfect model for Cato as he moves forward in his attempt to preserve *Roma et Libertas*. Accordingly, in lines 309-311, Cato appropriates Decius for his own current situation, recasting his own scenario. Taking a tone of hopeful determination in which he moves away from the imperfect *liceret* of 2.306 to the present subjunctive, Cato asks the armies involved in the civil war to seek out *him* alone (*me geminae figant acies, me Barbara telis | Rheni turba petat*). In this scenario, he envisions himself becoming a new Publius Decius Mus, the substitutionary target of all the weapons of civil war and recipient of all its necessary wounds (*cunctis ego pervius hastis | excipiam medius totius vulnera belli*), so that the Roman people may be preserved and victory in the end assured. As the next section shows, however, Cato will have to overcome some obstacles in adapting the example of Decius to his own situation.

Desired goals for Cato's self-sacrifice (312-319)
…absolve the sin debt owed the gods (312-313)
…end the need for war (314-319)

> hic redimat sanguis populos, hac caede luatur
> quidquid Romani meruerunt pendere mores.
> ad iuga cur faciles populi, cur saeva volentes
> regna pati pereunt? me solum invadite ferro,
> me frustra leges et inania iura tuentem.
> hic dabit, hic pacem iugulus finemque malorum
> gentibus Hesperiis: post me regnare volenti
> non opus est bello.

> May *this* blood redeem the people, *this* death absolve whatever debt it is that Roman immorality must pay. Why are the people so quick to the yoke, why so willing to perish just to endure cruel tyranny? Pierce *me* alone with the sword, watching in vain over hollow laws. *This* very throat right here will bring about peace and an end of evils for the people of Italy—after me, he who wants to rule will have no need for war.

Having introduced the Decius *exemplum* as the model for his own attempt at transforming his own future defeat into a beneficial self-sacrifice, Cato continues to lay out what *effects* such a Decius-like *devotio* could bring about—that is, of course, if he could actually perform one. In the first two lines (312-313) he addresses *Roma's* basic need for redemption by envisioning his own shed blood as the sacrificial *piaculum* to satisfy the gods' anger and the people's guilt (*redimat…luatur*). He then devotes the rest of the section to a discussion related to ending the underlying need for war in the first place. Cato's central theme is that of Roman slavery to tyranny and the corresponding loss of *libertas*. Since both Pompey and Caesar seek to set themselves up as a *dominus*, partisan involvement for either side is tantamount to a willing surrender of the participant's freedom. This is what leads Cato to ask in exasperation (314-315): why are the people so quick to submit themselves to a yoke of slavery by championing one of the would-be *domini* as if they *want* to endure the cruelties of a master? If only, he continues, the forces of civil war could target him alone (*me solum invadite ferro*) and bypass the rest of the Roman people, then his sacrifice could bring about an end to the evils hanging over the Roman nation and the people would remain free (*hic pacem iugulus finemque malorum | gentibus Hesperiis*). The implication is that, according to the model, a *devotio* by Cato on behalf of the Roman people would save them from needing to choose either side in a civil war and thereby avoid slavery under a master altogether. Cato concludes that since he is the only one who is still watching in vain over the empty laws and rights (*me frustra leges et inania iura tuentem*), once he is out of the way, the one who wants to rule will no longer have any need to wage civil war at all (*post me regnare volenti | non opus est bello*).

Unfortunately, this is precisely the problem. There will no longer be any need to wage further war after Cato is gone for the very reason that Cato is the only one who is still preserving—in a very real way, *commemorating*—the laws and *Libertas* of a free Rome. Thus, while the removal of Cato will indeed end the war and bring peace, this kind of peace will signal not the freedom of the Roman people but rather the completion of their enslavement to their new *dominus*.[58] What begins positively as a suggestion for eliminating the need for war ironically transforms into a frank admission that ending the way will only yield slavery. Cato genuinely wishes he could save his people from defeat and subjugation to tyranny, but his own words betray the fact that due to the nature of this civil war he cannot do so.

This revelation is but one of a number of serious problems that emerge upon closer examination that serve to explode any expectation that Cato can take up the Decius *exemplum* "as is" and enact this kind of *devotio* to once again save the Roman people. First, while the Battle of Veseris was *like* a civil war, Cato finds himself facing what *is* a civil war. This one discrepancy drastically alters the whole situation, because the whole concept of a *devotio* hinges upon two sides, *Romani* against a distinct *hostes* who are not *Romani*. In the Roman civil war, however, both sides are *Romani*—and both sides are *hostes*. The opposing combatants in truth only consist of one side. If Cato were somehow to devote "the enemy" to the gods above and below, he would undermine his whole purpose by devoting to death his fellow Romans, the very people he is aiming to preserve. Second, as discussed earlier in the speech, Cato has already acknowledged that

[58] Lucan has already confirmed this fact through the prophetic vision of the astrologer Figulus at the end of Book 1: *cum domino pax ista venit. duc, Roma, malorum | continuam seriem clademque in tempora multa | extrahe civili tantum iam libera bello* (1.670-672).

in this civil war defeat is inevitable for everybody involved. This time around, a heroic self-defeat simply cannot save the Roman people or *Roma et Libertas* from defeat as well.

One might ask why Cato would bring up the Decius model at all if he knows he cannot employ it. It is true that Cato himself shows how he cannot appropriate the Decius *exemplum*—at least not in the form it comes down to him from Livy through the exemplary tradition. Cato invokes the model, however, precisely because this *exemplum* can still provide the essential framework for Cato's own attempt at enacting a beneficial self-sacrifice *provided that* he can adapt it to fit the unique self-destructive nature of a civil war. Cato's challenge in this respect is twofold. He will first have to show that the *devotio* model can still be effective in creating a self-sacrifice that is beneficial not just for those who would be saved from defeat (the Roman army at Veseris) but even for those who have themselves *already* been defeated (Cato's fellow Romans). His ability to do so will be contingent upon a second task: showing that not all defeats in this world of civil war are made equal.

This concept of making a distinction between different kinds of defeat lies at the heart of the whole Decius *exemplum*. Decius's defeat cannot be lumped together in the same category with the Latins' defeat, as the two defeats result in and thus mean two completely different things. This leads us to see that the final, crucial similarity between the narrative worlds of Decius and Cato is the fact that the subversion of victory *and* defeat is in both a central feature. As Lucan has clearly illustrated throughout beginning with his proem (1.2-3), defeat is guaranteed for all who participate in civil war. The great revelation of this part of the speech is thus the notion that even in the midst of that defeat

there is something still worth fighting for whose outcome has *yet* to be decided. This new, ongoing war, Cato suggests, is a deeper moral conflict with the preservation of Old Rome's identity at its core. Even though *Roma* and *Libertas* are doomed to be defeated in this war, Lucan's Cato stands up to remind us that what becomes of them as time moves forward is *still* being decided, even into the poet's own day under Nero.[59] In light of this, the real power that the Decius *exemplum* offers Cato is a model of defeat that transcends the normal meaning of the word to yield a victory that will prove beneficial to others, both in his own time and forward into Lucan's time.

Although he acknowledges a traditional *devotio* will not work, the model invites us to look ahead to Cato's famous suicide at Utica and consider its potential for enacting just such a beneficial self-sacrifice. In Lucan, just as in the legend as a whole, it is Cato's suicide that always looms as the conclusion toward which his life is leading, as the act that more than any other defines his character and gives him meaning.[60] The *Bellum Civile* cuts off before it reaches the Utica narrative, but his suicide contains all the elements necessary to be regarded as a self-sacrifice on behalf of *Roma* and *Libertas*. In Lucan, it is this future suicide that stands as the chief manifestation of this transformation of defeat into victory. Yet it would be misleading to see this merely in terms only of a "victory of virtue" that merely benefits Cato himself. The model of Decius which Cato invokes for himself focuses on a self-sacrifice that specifically confers its benefits upon

---

[59] Cf. Stover (2008: 572), "For Lucan, as for others, the desire for *libertas* exemplified by the figure of Cato knows no limit, is ultimately never-ending." Cf. also Brisset (1964: 152). In the following chapter, I discuss the ways in which Lucan points to an ongoing war of the defeated against the victors in the aftermath of Caesar's victory at Pharsalus in Book 7.

[60] Stover (2008: 572) offers an excellent summary: "It was precisely the enduring symbolic power of Cato's defiant suicide that marked his death as an important nodal point in the ongoing conflict between tyranny and freedom. This allowed Cato to be imagined as an *exemplum virtutis* whose resistance to tyranny at all costs was seen by many as admirable and worthy of imitation. Cato himself died at Utica, but his example and his cause did not die with him."

others. The success of Cato's character in the *Bellum Civile* rests upon his ability to do just this. The more pessimistic readings of Lucan's Cato tend to go astray at this point by judging his success upon his ability to save his fellow Romans from defeat in the first place or upon the dubious viability of his Stoicism in what is seen to be an incompatibly chaotic universe. In this speech, however, Cato does not declare his intention to be primarily a virtuous Stoic *sapiens*, nor does he say he will save anything from defeat. He accepts that everyone and everything will be defeated—and this is precisely the point from which his real goals begin.

His true goal is not to *save Roma* and *Libertas* but instead to *commemorate* them, to ensure their preservation through the effective power of memory and so rescue them from the true death of being forgotten. Thus, we see that the goal expressed in the first half of the speech will ultimately be made possible by his ability to accomplish the goal he expresses in the second half. The fact that Cato's self-sacrifice can become a memorial for Old Rome is what unifies the two intended courses of action that Cato lays out in this speech. This focus upon identifying the two courses of action Cato sets up for himself and using them to guide a reading of Cato's speech is the chief element of my argument that I feel can offer an advance over current readings of Cato's speech. Most scholars, regardless of whether they approach the speech from a more positive or skeptical view of Cato's character, have tended to let the debates over Cato's Stoic authenticity and/or his moral superiority guide the agenda. What often gets overlooked in the philosophical and ethical debates is what Cato himself says he would like to accomplish by participating. The major conclusion that Ahl takes from Cato's speech, just to take one still-dominant example, is "the notion that self-sacrifice in a doomed but

worthy cause is not futile, that clinging to the ghosts of the past may, in fact, be morally correct."[61] But Cato—and Lucan—aim for *much more* than mere moral victories in this speech. These "ghosts of the past" are precisely what Cato will become a monument to so that he (along with the epic as a whole) might not only remind Lucan's audience of the moral losses that came with Caesar's victory but in addition do what funeral *monumenta* do: infuse the dead with life so that they can once again speak to the living and influence them to take action in response.

Memory is best preserved through the creation of monuments, and throughout the tradition the nature of Cato's self-death transformed him into a *monumentum* of the Rome that passed away when Caesar won.[62] In Lucan then, Cato will accomplish his first stated goal by erecting a funeral monument for *Roma* and *Libertas*, and the best way to do this is by means of his self-sacrifice which will ensure his own transformation into a powerful *exemplum* of those very things. In the same way that a funeral monument preserves the memory of the deceased and creates an *exemplum* of their life as a continued influence upon those who look upon that monument, Cato's *exemplum* becomes a figurative but still very real monument that grants Old Rome a kind of afterlife which can continue to impact all those who look upon it long after the physical civil war and its immediate political situation has been decided. This body of preserved memory becomes the benefit that Cato's *exemplum* offers to others. That memory also becomes an ongoing act of resistance on Lucan's part to what Rome became after the Caesars, giving rise to an ongoing struggle over the memory of what the Old Rome really meant.

---

[61] Ahl (1976: 241).

[62] For a survey of the Cato legend leading up to Lucan's time, see Chapter 1B.

Decision to join Pompey's camp explained (319-323)

> quin publica signa ducemque
> Pompeium sequimur? nec, si Fortuna favebit,
> hunc quoque totius sibi ius promittere mundi
> non bene compertum est: ideo me milite vincat
> ne sibi se vicisse putet.'

> Indeed, why don't I follow Republican standards with Pompey as my leader? It is certainly no secret that, if Fortune should favor him, he too seeks for himself right of mastery over the whole world. Therefore let him conquer with *me* as his soldier lest he think that he conquered for himself.

In this final section, essentially a coda to the main body of the speech, Cato explains why he is going to join Pompey's camp, at least on the surface. This explanation is made necessary here in part because Lucan needs to account for the historical fact that Cato campaigned on Pompey's behalf in the civil war. In light of all that Cato has just said about both Pompey and Caesar setting themselves up as would-be masters who would enslave their fellow Romans, it might seem that choosing either side would be inconsistent with Cato's principles and declared stance of siding with *Roma* et *Libertas*. The explanation that Lucan places in Cato's mouth, however, attempts to defend this action as consistent by showing once again that it is the unique nature and motive of his participation that separates him from all other participants. Cato accomplishes this by placing strategic emphasis on things that are *publica*. By placing *publica signa* before *ducem Pompeium* he is reminding us that his allegiance is not given to any individual but ultimately to the idea of Rome and her precious *Libertas* above all.[63] It is thus consistent that for the moment he will join the side that still legally represents Rome according to the constitutional power of the Senate. From this perspective, the

[63] Cf. Stover (2008: 574), "Cato will join Pompey's side, but he enters the fight not in order to support Pompey's autocratic agenda, like all the others. Rather, he enters the fray in order to defend the ideal of *libertas* against anyone who would assault its foundations."

Republic's *signa publica* (which happen to be allied with Pompey) square off against the seditious *signa privata* of Caesar. This formulation allows Cato to emphasize his allegiance to Rome herself while yet distancing himself from Pompey's unconstitutional ambitions of consolidating the power of the state upon himself.[64] Cato even acknowledges this true motive (*hunc quoque totius ius promittere mundi | non bene compertum est*) but suggests that one benefit of his joining Pompey's camp is that he will serve as a constant reminder—in reality an *exemplum*—to Pompey of the illegality of those ambitions (*ideo me milite vincat | ne sibi se vicisse putet*). Given that Pompey in the end was not the one who did the conquering, Lucan uses this irony to place Cato at a distinct remove from Pompey and yet still securely on the losing side. Such a move is necessary, for as he hinted in his speech, Cato must become fully defeated before he can come into his character's full potential in this epic.

Effect of the Speech on Brutus (323-325)

sic fatur, et acris
irarum movit stimulos iuvenisque calorem
excitat in nimios belli civilis amores.

(Thus he spoke, and he stirred up fierce stings of anger and fanned the young man's fire into an excessive love of civil war.)

Although Cato has brought his speech to a decisive conclusion, Lucan includes one final addendum by describing Brutus's reaction to what he has heard. Brutus, who formerly had urged Cato not to participate in the coming civil war in order to preserve his

[64] Ahl (1976: 246) also recognizes this point: "Pompey is the commander whose power is legally ratified by the senate; Caesar no longer legally holds office." Ahl, however, sees this explanation on Cato's part as a way to evade giving a definitive answer to the moral problem of getting Cato involved in the war when neither side is morally good (245). I do not find it quite as evasive as Ahl does; Cato's earlier, definitive declaration that he will pursue the side of *Roma et Libertas* in this civil war has already set up his participation in the camps of Pompey as being "in name only." And, as we shall see in the following chapter, Lucan doesn't participate in the civil war until the war ceases to be one in which leader fights against leader and instead becomes in which liberty fights against tyranny.

virtus, now responds to Cato's speech with emotion and a transformed zeal for joining the fray himself. As Lucan phrases it, what we witness is really an overreaction: Cato's speech "moves" him to sharp stings of anger (*acris irarum movit stimulos*), arouses his youthful passion (*iuvenis calorem excitat*) and leads him to an "excessive love of civil war" (*in nimios belli civilis amores*).[65]

The challenge is how to make sense of this mistaken overreaction.[66] Viewing it as one more in the long line of responses to imminent defeat that appear in Lucan's epic offers the best explanation. Brutus's initial speech represents his first response, a mindset in favor of philosophical detachment. After Cato's speech, however, in which Cato argues for involvement in a specialized fashion, we see a changed response in which Brutus's mind is now set on involvement as well. His passions are excited precisely because he now sees a path open to him to participate in civil war. His involvement, however, as Lucan's readers well know, will prove very different in character than the path that Cato takes for himself. Unlike Cato, Brutus will go on to fight on behalf of *Roma* and *Libertas* by physically assassinating Caesar and continuing the war against tyranny as an actual soldier in the field.[67] In this light, Brutus's zeal for involvement

---

[65] Cf. Ahl (1976: 247), "Not only do Cato's words move Brutus from neutrality to active partisanship, but, unless I mistake Lucan's meaning, they produce an overreaction on Brutus' part." Lucan's use of *nimios* is the key here in seeing Brutus as taking his partisanship to a level far beyond that which Cato advocates for himself. Cf. Lebek (1976: 188-9).

[66] Ahl (1976: 247) also argues that Brutus's reaction should not be seen as undercutting the efficacy of Cato's speech, but he only goes on to suggest that it points primarily a personality difference between the two: "Brutus' reaction to Cato's speech, then, implies little more than Lucan's awareness of Brutus' fiery temperament as contrasted with Cato's calmer and stabler nature." I argue that this addendum points rather to a deeper distinction between the two based on the distinct ways each involves himself in the civil war.

[67] As his speech makes clear, Cato's mission is to commemorate and preserve Rome and the *Libertas* that once defined her, NOT to overthrow Caesar politically or militarily. It is a subtle but crucial distinction between the two characters. I think it likely that Lucan would have built upon this distinction later in the epic had he finished it, and I am convinced that he would have later returned to Brutus as an active character, just as he brought back Cato in Book 9 after a lengthy absence.

becomes “excessive” precisely because he *will* participate in civil war in the traditional way by slaying his fellow Roman citizens.

Whatever the implications of this for our understanding of Lucan’s own feelings about the assassination of Caesar, this addendum still serves to throw into deeper relief the unique nature of Cato’s coming involvement in this civil war that sets him apart from all other participants. The stage is not yet set, however, for Cato to put his plans for commemorating Rome and becoming a beneficial sacrifice for her into motion. As we will see, his role requires that he cannot reappear on Lucan’s epic stage until the *victor* and *victus* have been fully decided. It is Pompey’s defeat at Pharsalus in Book 7 and his subsequent beheading in Book 8 that mark Caesar as the *victor*, and so it is for this reason that we now jump ahead to Book 9 where Cato returns once more, this time to continue the fight against the winner.

CHAPTER 7
MEMORIA REDUX

Cato's Disappearance

In his Book 2 speech, Cato lays out the prospect that the nature of *his* participation will be different from that of everyone else. His two-fold statement of purpose is to memorialize a perished *Roma* and *Libertas* and do so by means of a beneficial self-sacrifice. This holds out the prospect that Cato can transform his defeat into a meaningful victory of memory for Rome, thereby transcending the universal defeat of civil war. The problem facing Cato in Book 2, however, is that there is no avenue open for him at that time to get involved in the way that he has forecast for himself. Pompey and Caesar are still fighting to see which will become *victor* and enslave Rome, the part of the war that Cato will have nothing to do with. After a powerful introduction in Book 2, Lucan slides his Cato quietly into the background to bide his time. It is surprising that Lucan should make his third main character vanish for six entire books while the fate of Rome is being decided. It is just as surprising that scholars have rarely explored the nature of Cato's prolonged absence or questioned why Lucan would do this and what narrative purpose it might achieve.[1] It is true that Cato was not historically

[1] Cato's *reappearance* has of course been regularly noted by scholars, but the potential significance of his *absence* has been almost entirely overlooked. Narducci (2002: 405) for example in his detailed chapter on Cato jumps straight from Book 2 to Book 9 without much comment. Ahl (1976: 252) is one of the few to confront the question directly, concluding that his absence is in part answered by the historical fact that Cato's political and military involvement in the civil war remained relatively insignificant until after Pompey's beheading, but that this has the added advantage of allowing Lucan "to keep Cato unsullied by the partisan struggles culminating in the battle of Pharsalia and Pompey's death." In this respect Ahl, who sees Lucan's goal for Cato as the establishment of a moral superior to the victorious yet tyrannical Caesar, mainly limits his focus to the rhetorical benefits of uninvolvement and overlooks the necessity of *defeat* as a prerequisite to Cato's reappearance. Ahl (252-3) does correctly acknowledge, however, that Cato's absence until Book 9 means that his reentry can coincide with the new emphasis on the "fight between Caesar and the republic rather than between Caesar and Pompey," to be discussed below. An intriguing Homeric comparison is raised by Lausberg (1985: 1596) who points out that Lucan's narrative technique of delaying a major character's central action until later in the epic is reminiscent of Homer's "späten Handlungseintritt des Achill" who does not return to the main action until *Iliad* 18.

present at Pharsalus, but this is no obvious reason why Lucan should have chosen to keep Cato out of the narrative until Pompey's death. Cato is, after all, the third major character in the epic; Lucan at any point could have returned to Cato to deliver another speech about the importance of *libertas* or something else poetically significant, but he did not. This conscious choice to keep Cato out of the narrative throughout the central portions of the epic stands out as significant to understanding Lucan's vision for this character, and it is essential to consider why the poet would do this and specifically what he gains by doing so.

Foremost, Cato's disappearance throughout the heart of the epic (as we have it) is clear evidence that Lucan's vision for Cato in this epic has almost nothing to do with who would become the *victor* but instead has everything to do with the response of the defeated in the aftermath of defeat. This means that before Cato can reenter the story, one of the two sides must be defeated in order for the winner to become a *dominus* and thus by definition also seal the defeat of *Roma* and *Libertas*. The climax of the central part of the epic comes with the pivotal Battle of Pharsalus in Book 7 where this original conflict is brought to resolution.[2] It is Caesar's victory that resolutely decides the

[2] Note for example the intentional combination of the two key terms at 7.580-1 in reference to Caesar's deliberate choice to target the Roman Senate, *unde petat Romam, libertas ultima mundi | quo steterit ferienda loco*. Cf. Ahl (1976: 57), "When Lucan assures us that the battle of Pharsalia is the great catastrophe of the republic, he is telling us that this is the moment when constitutional government, or what was left of it, fell. From Pharsalia onwards, *libertas*, the republic, no longer exists at Rome, through it continues as an ideal, enshrined in men like Cato. In this sense the battle of Pharsalia marks the day that the Roman state died, when crime became law." Cf. also Rudich (1997: 149). Henderson (1998: 179), in his analysis of the scenes of Sullan carnage in Rome from the flashback in Book 2, argues convincingly that "*All* 'battlefields' in *BC*, however 'Emathian' at the concrete level, will take place on, on a displacement of, the *Campus Martius*…because this is the centre, and the pont, of Roman/world civil war." Lucan at first emphasizes the seeming finality of it all by calling Pharsalus the *funus mundi* (7.617), which will bring universal ruin upon Rome for all time (*in totum mundi prosternimur aevum*, 7.640). Yet, as I have argued, funeral imagery in this epic carries with it the paradoxical prospect for continuance and renewal because of the reviving potential of memory. Indeed, Lucan goes on to show at 7.695-6 that the defeat at Pharsalus is not quite so final as it might first appear, a point discussed immediately below.

question of *winner* and *defeated*, and it is the subsequent beheading of Pompey—in a real sense the "beheading" of the ruler from the Roman body politic—that confirms it.

And yet the outcome at Pharsalus is pivotal in another crucial matter which suggests that Caesar's victory is not as universally complete as it would first seem. At precisely the moment when the outcome of the *military* civil war is being decided in Book 7, Lucan shows us that a new conflict is arising to replace it. This is a second, more overtly *ideological* war to be waged between *Libertas* and *Caesar*. Speaking to Pompey as he flees the battlefield, the narrator intrudes to say:

> fuge proelia dira
> ac testare deos nullum, qui perstet in armis,
> iam tibi, Magne, mori. ceu flebilis Africa damnis
> et ceu Munda nocens Pharioque a gurgite clades,
> sic et Thessalicae post te pars maxima pugnae
> non iam Pompei nomen populare per orbem
> nec studium belli, sed par quod semper habemus,
> Libertas et Caesar, erit; teque inde fugato
> ostendit moriens sibi se pugnasse senatus. (7.689-697)

> Flee the deadly battle and so call the gods to witness that nobody who stays on to fight dies any longer *for you*, Magnus. Just as is the case for Africa weeping over her losses and for guilty Munda and the slaughter alongside the Pharian stream, even so the greatest portion of the fighting in Thessaly will no longer be for the name of Pompey, held in favor throughout the world, nor even for the pursuit of war for its own sake, but on behalf of the paired combatants which we always have, *Libertas and Caesar*. Once you fled, the Senate in perishing proved that they fought *for themselves*.

The original conflict that sparked this whole civil war reaches its point of decision when Caesar becomes the *victor* and *dominus Romae*. Lucan's narrator, however, declares that once Pompey admits defeat and leaves the battlefield a fundamental transformation in the nature of the war being waged takes place.

What arises now is a new war defined by a change both in combatants and in motive.[3] From this point on it will be *Libertas* set against *Caesar*, the loser against the winner.[4] The striking paradox is that a defeated *Libertas* can stand up once again to wage a new war at all! Yet by this new programmatic formulation, Lucan boldly confirms that a military and political defeat is but a defeat at one level only—*not all defeats are made equal*. This war, to be waged into the future by the defeated partisans of Old Rome against the Caesarian victors, proves that the defeated not only still have a war they can fight in but also that there is still something, even in defeat, worth fighting for. David Quint's excellent summary of Lucan's technique here at 7.695-6 is worth repeating in its entirety:

---

[3] This question of whether to interpret the defeat at Pharsalus as the despairing end point or a transitional turning point is one of the main areas in which I disagree with more pessimistic readers of Lucan. Johnson (1987: 122) is representative when he comments on 7.695-6 with his usual flair: "The never-ending wrong. Freedom destroyed again and again by fear disguised as power. The poem has no unity of action because the murder of freedom by insane fear and anger has no beginning, middle, or end, no comforting Peripatetic articulations. It has only the crazy cycles of Nietzsche's nightmare." Others have promoted this idea of the endless civil war, especially Masters (1992: 251), saying that "the civil war can have no ending. Everything about the war and the poem is boundless, illimitable, infinite." In this perceived endlessness implicit in Lucan's epic they read a pessimistic cycle of defeat and ruin from which there is no escape. I happen to agree partly that there is an endlessness implicit in the text, but in contrast I read it as the hopeful prospect of an ongoing war of resistance of *Libertas* against the tyrannical excesses of Caesarism. In this I side with those who see Book 7 as marking a turning point in the nature of the conflict that reveals the potential hope of continued resistance even in defeat, e.g. Marti (1945: 371), Leigh (1997: 305), Bartsch (1998: 141), Narducci (2002: 323), Behr (2007: 44), Stover (2008: 572). The exact nature and significance of this ongoing struggle is a matter of further debate. On this passage, cf. Leigh (1997: 155-7), Bartsch (1998: 95). Perhaps tellingly, Sklenar (2003: 120), the most extreme of the pessimistic readings of Lucan, omits any discussion of this important passage altogether in his analysis of Pompey in Book 7.

[4] The pairing strongly suggests that Caesar here is more the idea of "Caesarism," represented by Caesar the *dominus furens*, rather than the character himself. Narducci (2002: 324) emphasizes this point, linking (I think correctly) this *Caesar* directly with Nero, the "Caesar" of Lucan's own present: "Cesare non è più solo il nome del proconsole delle Gallie, del vincitore di Farsàlo, dell'uomo che impose a Roma la sua dittatura; è il nome del 'principe', il nome che, chiunque se ne fregi, significa un regime di oppressione; è, senza dubbio, anche il nome di Nerone: dell'uomo che il poeta della *Pharsalia* complottava per uccidere." Cf. also Lintott (1971: 503), Ahl (1976: 56), Johnson (1987: 32), Quint (1993: 148). Ahl also points out the use of *par* (cf. 1.126) with its gladiatorial overtones to drive home further the imagery of two combatants locked in struggle. For a detailed reading of the rhetorical structure of 7.689-697 and the significance of *Libertas* as a central concept here, see Lebek (1976: 240-4). He points out that "der Antagonismus *Libertas et Caesar*" here at the end of the battle forms a kind of ring-effect by following upon Caesar's speech earlier at 7.250-329 in which he is portrayed by Lucan "als verbrecherischen Feind der Freiheit" (242).

> The passage also implies that the *Pharsalia*, as it wins adherents to Pompey's cause, may pave the way to future action, new Pharsalias. And this sense of futurity and transhistorical continuity becomes explicit in the narrator's famous declaration at the end of the battle, when Pompey has fled the scene. The absence of the warlord leader allows the true political significance of the conflict to become clear:
>
> *sed par quod semper habemus,*
> *Libertas et Caesar erit.* (695-96)
>
> (but the struggle which we always have with us will be between Freedom and Caesarism.)
> The confusion of tenses—present and future describing a past event—again spells out the message. Precisely at the moment of crushing republican defeat, the poem announces a sequel of ongoing resistance: this is the war we are still fighting, despite setbacks. Such assertions at the beginning and ending of the narration of Pharsalia counterbalance the despairing declaration of finality that lies between them."[5]

Lucan's narrator tells us that this is an ongoing war that the "defeated" will fight, now and in the future—even including, it would seem, Lucan himself and his own readers.[6] This hope that the defeated *can* still accomplish something meaningful through their response to defeat is Lucan's great revelation about the nature of the conflict over the final books of his epic.

There is finally another reason why the conflict must be redefined through defeat before Cato can act. His model for beneficial sacrifice is that of the *devotio* enacted by P.

---

[5] Quint (1993: 150-1).

[6] The striking combination of the future *erit* with the present *habemus*, spoken from the perspective of the authorial narrator, achieves the narrative effect of presenting this conflict as an ongoing conflict that is both present and ongoing into the projected future. Quint (1993: 151) goes on to link this with Lucan's intent *not* to give the poem a proper sense of closure: "The very fact that the poem continues rambling along after the battle of Pharsalia denies a sense of an ending to Caesar's victory. The struggle between Liberty and Caesar goes on and on, and the epic projects no goal or teleology for its narrative: moreover, it warns against the very desire for such ending, which imperial narratives of history are only too willing to provide." This lack of closure in Lucan is thus to be identified with a hopeful attitude that the present and future may yet be modified rather than a pessimistic or nihilistic view that the future is doomed to the same universal defeat or emptiness, e.g. Henderson (1998), Sklenar (2003). As Behr (2007: 44-5) rightly argues, Lucan thus uses this "appeal to futurity" to invite his readers to identify with the narrator in hoping for a better future that is not yet realized. On Lucan's use of this distinctive narrative device, see also Marti (1975: 86-8), Leigh (1997: 304-6), Bartsch (1998: 140-8), Narducci (2002: 324). For a closer examination of Lucan's striking use of the present tense, see Leigh (1997: 311ff).

Decius Mus, the leader who made himself a substitute sacrifice in order to ensure his side's victory and the enemy's defeat. As discussed earlier, civil war conflates the two opposing forces so that there is in reality only one Roman side in the act of self-destructing. The redefinition of the conflict, however, into the idea of *Libertas* set against the idea of tyrannical *Caesarism* reestablishes the opposition of two distinct sides. The result is that the inherent problem of civil war, the fact that waging it requires suicidal self-destruction, is done away with. In this light, Cato in Book 9 will not really be continuing to wage *civil war* at all but rather something new altogether—a more traditional conflict with two opposing sides, yet one not fought between soldiers but between ideas. And Cato's weapon of choice will be the power of memory. His absence is not just rhetorically convenient but in fact necessary throughout the center of the epic for the reason that he cannot act on his agenda until Rome's defeat transforms the nature of the conflict into one that he actually *can* fight: the *victa causa* against the *victrix causa*.

Pompey's Reappearance

The second condition that needs to transpire before Cato can act on his agenda is his transformation into an *exemplum* for the defeated. It should be noted, however, that the "defeated" are to be considered defeated only in a certain sense. At one level, as we have already seen, everyone who participates in civil war will, by definition, be defeated. Lucan's Cato, however, emerges in Book 9 as the new leader of the remnants of Pompey's army which he moulds into an army that shares his allegiance to the same things he pursues, *Roma* and *Libertas*. Those in his camp will be the defeated who labor on in the hope of transcending their first defeat to reshape things and in the end achieve

victory. In Book 9, with Caesar the firmly identified *victor* and Pompey beheaded, the stage is now finally set for Cato to reappear and step into the leadership vacuum created by Pompey's demise.[7] Before he can fully assume his proper role, however, he must work to convince others that the nature of the war to be waged has fundamentally changed. It is this transformation of how Cato and those around him perceive this new war that occupies the first section of Book 9.

The first aspect of Cato's sudden reappearance into the story that needs to be examined is the significant fact that it comes in the context of Pompey's own sudden—and most unexpected—reappearance. Book 8 narrates Pompey's extended scene of death by beheading and concludes with an impromptu beachfront funeral, with memorials made both by the quaestor Cordus (8.712-793) and by Lucan's narrator through a closing eulogy that particularly focuses on the memory and meaning of Pompey's grave for future generations (8.793-872). The narrative of Book 8 thus gives every indication that Pompey's role as an acting character has been brought to a close, but unexpectedly the first lines of Book 9 declare that this is not so:

> At non in Pharia manes iacuere favilla
> nec cinis exiguus tantam compescuit umbram;
> prosiluit busto semustaque membra relinquens
> degeneremque rogum sequitur convexa Tonantis. (9.1-4)

> But his *manes* did not rest within Pharian flame, nor did the tiny bit of ash confine so great an *umbra*; it leapt forth from the funeral fire, and leaving behind the half-burnt limbs and the debased pyre it sought out the lofty sphere of the Thunderer.

The sudden "*at non*" of the first line both connects the actions of Pompey's *manes* to the previous book and simultaneously signals a break and the beginning of something new

[7] On this point, cf. Raschle (2001: 13); see also Joyce (1982: 123).

altogether. After soaring upwards to take in his fill of the True Light enjoyed by virtuous souls (9.11-12), his shade suddenly descends back to earth as the "avenger of Crimes" and takes up a kind of new residence in two people, Brutus and Cato:

> …vidit quanta sub nocte iaceret
> nostra dies risitque sui ludibria trunci.
> hinc super Emathiae campos et signa cruenti
> Caesaris ac sparsas volitavit in aequore classes,
> et scelerum vindex in sancto pectore Bruti
> sedit et invicti posuit se mente Catonis. (9.13-18)

> …his shade saw how much darkness of night our day lay under and smiled at the farce of his own headless corpse. Then he flew out over the Emathian plains and standards of bloody Caesar and the fleets spread out upon the sea, and as the Avenger of Crimes settled in the holy breast of Brutus and placed himself in the mind of *undefeated Cato*.

There are many surprises that Lucan gives us readers here, foremost of which is the fact that contrary to previous expectation, Pompey is not quite as "dead" as we thought.[8] Lucan specifically places Pompey's *manes* and *umbra* as the active, collective subject in this passage that is usually described as the "apotheosis" of Pompey.[9] Although the exact nature and cultural significance of the *manes* are debated, what is

[8] Cf. Ahl (1976: 188): "Yet, with the death of Pompey, as with the death of Priam or of Dido, the end is not total and complete. In fact, as Pompey dies, it is almost as if the soul of Rome were released from its weak and ravaged body, much as Pompey's soul is released at the beginning of *Pharsalia* 9." I think Ahl goes too far in saying that the very "soul of Rome" is embodied in Pompey, for Lucan's Pompey in life proved unequal to the task. It is only in death that he can become a vehicle for the idea of Rome to those who come after.

[9] This so-called "apotheosis" of Pompey has produced much commentary, as it is one of the more unexpected episodes in the epic. Radicke (2004: 463) for example takes it at face value as Lucan's poetic method of legitimizing the transfer of leadership from Pompey to Cato, while Johnson (1987) at the other end of the spectrum calls it "ridiculous by design" (72) and refers to it as "the silly blaze of his astonishing apotheosis" (79). See Wildberger (2005: 76ff) for a discussion (on Stoic elements in the scene) and a thorough bibliography. This episode owes much to Stoic thought concerning the fate of the *vir sapiens* after death, and in particular shows similarities to Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*. Commentators usually talk about the flight of Pompey's "soul" or "spirit" in the generic sense, e.g. Marti (1945: 373), Narducci (2002: 335), Sklenar (2003: 126). This, however, overlooks Lucan's careful choice of vocabulary here. The specific references to Pompey's *Manes* and umbra as the subjects in lines 1-2 strongly invoke the funereal (and thus memorializing) associations that both close out Book 8 and that continue to hang over the action throughout the whole of Book 9.

clear is that they represent the "after-elements" of a deceased person that in Roman thought are most intimately associated with funerals, memory, and continued agency after death.[10] We find that the *umbra* of Pompey is suddenly no longer merely an "empty shadow" but is rather one capable of renewed, vital activity.[11] The memorialized Pompey at the end of Book 8 transitions right into the active *manes Pompeii* found here, which in turn transitions directly into the active Cato who will take over the focus of Lucan's narrative for the rest of the book. For the purposes of this study, the significance of this opening episode lies in the fact that it reintroduces Cato as the end point of a chain of events that begins with Pompey's defeat by victorious Caesar and continues through Pompey's own death and commemoration. This sequence draws our attention to the connection between this commemoration and the continued agency and influence of the dead upon the living.[12]

---

[10] For more on the Roman conception of *Manes* and *umbra* in connection with the spirits of the dead, see King (1998); see also Brena (1999: 288-9) on this passage. In literature, when referring to the soul of the deceased the words appear interchangeable.

[11] Cf. Leigh (1997: 305) who recognizes a fundamental transformation in the post-death Pompey who "has found a place for himself in the Republican tradition, the firm ideological grounding of which could once only clearly be perceived after he had run away." I read the opening lines of Book 9 as a response to 1.135ff where Lucan famously describes Pompey as a "shadow" (*stat magni nominis umbra*) and as a dying tree (*truncus*) that creates a shadow (*efficit umbram*, 1.140; on this simile see Feeney (1986: 239-43)). Back in Book 1 we have every reason to read it as a portrait of an ineffectual Pompey who sits on his laurels and is poised to fall under his own weight. Here in Book 9, however, I would argue that we see the idea of *umbra* transformed and imbued with new, effectual power. Ovid offers a useful parallel at Fast. 5.463 (more on which see below) where he describes Remus's *umbra* as an *inanis imago*, yet he convinces his parents to institute the Lemuria in his honor, showing that this "empty spectre" in the end proved potent enough to impact the living. I think that these passages also shed some interpretative light of Marcia's comments at 2.341-5, where she argues to Cato that she wants to remarry so that she can at least enjoy the *nomen inane* of Cato's spouse and that *Catonis Marcia* be at least inscribed on her tombstone. There, the value of such commemoration remains problematic: is Marcia grasping at a seemingly-mirthless marriage just to claim back a name that in the end she admits must remain an empty consolation? The specific commemoration of Pompey's name (8.793) and his subsequent post-mortem vitality and influence here in Book 9 seems to me to suggest that a powerful *nomen* remembered after death is anything but "empty." On this episode in general, see Ahl (1976: 247-52); cf. also Sklenar (2003: 72-8).

[12] In contrast to many, I do not read this as an actual apotheosis; Lucan intentionally evokes the imagery of an apotheosis and then suddenly brings us back to earth by transforming the scene into the kind in which

A passage in Ovid's *Fasti* on the origin of the Lemuria—the festival for honoring and placating the dead—offers some striking parallels that will prove helpful in interpreting this flight of Pompey's *umbra*.[13] At *Fasti* 5.451ff, Ovid tells how after Romulus "planted his fraternal shade in the grave" (*tumulo fraternas condidit umbras*, 5.451), the *umbra Remi* (5.457) appears to his mourning parents in a vision. He specifically beseeches them to honor him with a festival in memory of the dead, to be named Remuria after him (from which Lemuria is asserted to be a corruption). This passage offers parallels at many levels for Pompey's interaction with Cato here at the beginning of Book 9. First, the *umbra* of both Remus (*nunc sum elapsa rogi flammis*, *Fast.* 5.463) and Pompey (*prosiluit busto*, *BC* 9.3) come forth from the remains of the funeral pyre. Note specifically the parallel language of each text in Remus's *ossa perusta* (*Fast.* 5.454) and Pompey's *semusta membra* (*BC* 9.3); each also has a *rogus* from which their *umbra* came forth (*Fast*. 5.463 and *BC* 9.4). This episode also echoes Cato's first appearance back in Book 2, for in both we find the image of a parent grieving over the funeral of a child who has perished—and not by any regular death but specifically that brought about through fraternal conflict. From these parallels I think that Lucan is consciously invoking this Ovidian intertext here. If this is true, it can help answer the

---

the *manes* of the deceased visits a living person (cf. the previous note). It is typical of such scenes for the *manes* to ask the living for closure and/or vengeance, and it is this context that I argue this scene invokes.

[13] There are numerous other examples of the *manes* as an active force that could be brought into the discussion. In Livy we find that the slain Verginia acts as a post-mortem *manes* (3.58.11) who ceases to wander about Rome seeking justice only after those responsible for her death have been punished. Cf. also Lucretius 3.41-54 and Ovid *Fasti* 2.570 on the need to placate the *manes* of the deceased, Vergil *Aeneid* 7.643 on the continued life of the *manes* in the poetic Underworld, Horace *Ep*. 5.94 on the power of the *umbra* and *manes* (used here seemingly interchangeably) to seek vengeance after death, and numerous passages in Propertius (e.g. 1.19, 2.8.19, 2.13.32 and 57, 3.1.1, and 4.5.3) on their intimate connection with funeral commemorations and their potential power for interacting with the living. The programmatic opening line of 3.1.1 is particularly interesting, for here we find the poet directly addressing the *Callimachi Manes* in asking its permission to enter its "grove," thus conveying the image of a power that must be reckoned with even long after death. The collective point is that death does not always have the final word.

vexing question of what Pompey's *umbra* is supposed to be trying to accomplish here in Book 9, a question that is otherwise left unexplained by Lucan. The passage in Ovid depicts the *umbra* of the deceased appearing before the living specifically in order to impart a mission designed to perpetuate and commemorate the dead. The Ovidian parallels here suggest that Pompey's *umbra* is also visiting Cato to impart a similar mission, which as it turns out is the very mission of commemoration that Cato in fact claimed for himself back in Book 2.[14]

Cato's Reappearance

It is in this context of memorialization and renewed life that Lucan brings Cato fully back into the narrative.[15] He paradoxically appears as *Cato invictus* (9.18), which would seem a curious title given that Cato is about to reconstitute the remnants of Pompey's soundly-defeated army. More specifically, it is his *mens* that is *invicta*. His speech in Book 2, with its invocation of Decius Mus's *devotio* as a model of beneficial self-sacrifice, established his character trajectory as one whose goal was always to become defeated, but in such a way that this act would transcend that very defeat. This word choice thus reinforces the fact that the nature of the war being fought by Cato now

[14] Cato also states back in Book 2 that he wishes he could become a beneficial self-sacrifice like Decius Mus, and I wonder if it is significant for our reading of the opening of Book 9 that in Livy's account of the *devotio*, the *Di Manes* are the last of the gods that Decius invokes before charging the enemy (8.9.6). Just as the unnamed *Manes* helped make the *devotio* possible for Decius, perhaps too the appearance of Pompey's *manes* will make it possible for Cato to carry out his own mission of self-sacrifice. As for Brutus, I see the mission passed to him by Pompey's *umbra* as one of vengeance (*scelerum vindex*, 9.17), which is the usual request by the aggrieved *manes et umbra* to the living.

[15] See Lausberg (1985: 1596), who in noting the comparison between Cato's and Achilles' late reentry into the action makes the further observation that in both epics the very meaning of their participation has been transformed when the characters do step back onto center stage: "als vollwertiger Verteidiger von Roms Freiheit setzt er vom 9. Buch an den Kampf, den Pompeius mehr aus Eigeninteresse geführt hatte, fort, vergleichbar mit Achills Fortsetzung des Kampfes, den vorher sein nicht vollwertiger Stellvertreter Patroklos geführt hatte." He makes the further interesting observation that Achilles' reentry comes in *Iliad* 18 (out of 24 total books), and Cato's reentry comes in *BC* 9, which would be at the same relative position if we postulate a 12-book scope for Lucan's epic.

in Book 9 is different, for he can paradoxically be *victus* and *invictus* at the same time. This in turn illustrates that not only the nature of the war but also the figure of Cato himself has changed. In Book 2 he appeared mostly in the role of the sage, whose advice Brutus sought so intently. There, he was a leader only of those immediately surrounding him, safe inside his own home and removed from the battlefield, a source of guidance only to a few. He could speak only in terms of potential courses of actions, for defeat had not yet been brought about by Caesar's victory.

Now, however, the onset of defeat has ironically allowed Cato act to his full potential. Lucan's internal narrator confirms this immediately following the flight of Pompey's *umbra*. While the two rivals waged the original civil war over who would become *dominus*, Cato "hated the cause of Pompey" (*oderat et Magnum*, 9.21), but after that first civil war was decided, he was "wholly Pompeian" (*iam pectore toto | Pompeianus erat*, 9.23-4). Only after Pompey was defeated and no longer was eligible to become a *dominus* could he be transformed safely into a symbol of a perished pre-Caesarian *Roma*. Lucan then summarizes the impact of Cato's return: 1) he receives the *patria* into his guardianship since it lacked a guardian (*patriam tutore carentem | excepit*, 9.24-5), which continues to develop Cato as a kind of new *pater patriae* in direct competition with Caesar; 2) he revives the trembling limbs of the people (*populi trepidantia membra refovit*, 25), which shows Cato's power to restore life and triumph over the fear that civil war brings; and 3) he returns the cast-aside swords back to idle hands (*ignavis manibus proiectos reddidit enses*, 9.26), which shows that there is still a struggle worth fighting for. Lucan brings this re-introduction of Cato to a close by asserting that he waged civil war neither from a desire to rule nor from a fear of slavery

brought by defeat (*nec regnum cupiens gessit civilia bella | nec servire timens*, 9.27-8). The hope of a unique participation for Cato expressed back in Book 2 has become a reality, for unlike the other combatants of the original civil war he did not wage war for himself but rather for *Libertas* (*nil causa fecit in armis | ille sua*, 9.28-9).[16] It is important to note that the cause became that of *Libertas* only after the *funeral* of Pompey (*totae post Magni funera partes | Libertatis erant*, 9.29-30) and not merely his *mors*. Lucan emphasizes the funeral imagery, yet here the *funus* of Pompey does not express loss but is instead a creative act that makes the fight for *Libertas* possible, suggesting once more the transforming power of the *funus* and its attendant commemoration. Indeed, this epic is not over but is starting a new chapter with Cato now in the lead role.[17] From this point onward, his success or failure will hinge upon a basic question: what *can* the defeated party accomplish now that the victor has been decided?

A Flowering of Memory

The scenes that follow the reappearance of Cato point to an answer to this question. As forecast in 9.24-30 (especially the use *refovit*), Cato will revive the defeated

[16] Cf. Morford (1967: 123). Sklenar (2003: 80) argues that the language here subverts the praise of Cato since "These lines show the Stoic paragon in a decidedly un-Stoic posture." Yet as I have already argued, Lucan's goal is not to portray a flawless Stoic paragon but rather an epic character who will engage in this conflict as a Roman first and foremost.

[17] Cf. Radicke (2004: 461) who asserts that Lucan "als erstes Buch einer neuen Tetrade konzipiert, die Cato als neuen Helden in den Mittelpunkt stellt"; see also Rutz (1979: 186) "Die Rolle, die er bei Dyrrhachium gespielt hat (Plut. Cato 54), wird übergangen. So kann Cato am Beginn des neunten Buches die Rolle des Führers der Freiheitskämpfer übernehmen." Behr (2007: 14) on this passage concludes "When the gods (who favor Caesar) have abandoned the Republican cause, Cato must intervene and the narrator himself must communicate to his heroes the significance of their gesture in the face of death." Apropos to this idea of new beginnings, I think it is significant that Pompey's "flight plan" takes him back over the battlefield of Pharsalus. Lucan specifically states that his *umbra* flies *super Emathiae campos et signa cruenti | Caesaris* (9.15-6), using language that consciously evokes the epic's proem which opens with *Emathios campos* in the very first line and a few lines later mentions the battling *signis signa* (1.6-7). Thus the flight of Pompey's *umbra* can be read as literally going back to the proem and signaling the start of a new story. Whereas the proem was full of *paired* troops and standards (*signis signa, pares aquilas, pila minantia pilis*, 1.6-7), here in Book 9 we see only the standards of the *victor*, *Casesar*, suggesting again that this new war to be waged by Cato and others will not be like the original civil war.

remnants of Pompey's armies by redefining their mission and what they are fighting for (9.190-293). Before this takes place, however, Lucan fills the intervening scenes (9.30-189) practically to bursting with a constant stream of funeral imagery and acts of commemoration. The enactment of *memoria* thus stands as an apparent causal agent in the revival of a new opposition to Caesar.

The first thing that Cato actually does as a character in Book 9 is gather up the defeated remnants of Pompey's army scattered along the shores of Greece and sail across to Libya (9.30-44).[18] The first thing that happens once he gets there, however, is that Cornelia and the rest of the Pompeian fleet arrive in a manner of a full funeral procession, still mourning the death of Pompey (*luctus planctusque ferebant*, 9.49). Even "hardy Cato" (*duri Catonis*, 9.50) is moved to tears when he hears to the funeral cries, a response that hearkens back to his own funeral simile from Book 2 of a father moved by *dolor* to participate in the commemoration of the deceased. Lucan then narrates from Cornelia's perspective the events from the time of Pompey's beheading up to their arrival at Cato's camp. We read that that the ships lingered in case Pompey's *truncus* might float away from the shore and out to open sea (*ne forte repulses | litoribus Phariis remearet in aequora truncus*, 9.52-3). The flotilla feels free to depart, however, only after the distant flames of the funeral pyre gave proof that he had in fact received his funeral (*ostenditque rogum non iusti flamma sepulchri*, 9.54). One remarkable aspect of this scene is that it allows Lucan to employ Vergilian echoes to show that he is finally rescuing Pompey's

[18] Lucan emphasizes their defeated status by calling these troops collectively the *fragmenta ruinae* (9.33) and their ships *victas carinas* (9.35).

truncus from the *litus* Vergil had left him.[19] Reinforcing the narrative of Pompey's funeral at the end of Book 8, here we—like Cornelia and her fellow Romans aboard the ships—are witnesses to the funeral that testifies to the fact that Pompey no longer lies haphazardly upon the shore and is no longer without a name.[20] Lucan's epic *monumentum* has given him his memorial.

The anxiety to perform a proper funeral and commemorate the dead is what drives these events, and it is in this frame of mind that Cornelia fills much of her subsequent speech with yet more evocative funeral imagery. She first laments that she was unable to enact the funeral herself, describing the various rituals she did *not* get to do in detail (9.55-62).[21] She then seeks to reign in her emotions, asking her own personified *dolor* what we need tombs for since we can carry the memory of the deceased in our hearts, finally crying out "Let the survivor who will live on seek out the ashes!"[22] Her mood at this moment is one bereft of the will to live, but even her words of despair point to a crucial truth that those who *will* live on (*victura*) will in fact benefit from witnessing funeral monuments.[23] Her next words in fact confirm the power of tombs to keep the memory of the deceased alive when she admits that the sight of the funeral pyre, even

---

[19] Note the intertext of *litoribus…truncus* with Vergil's famous description of Priam/Pompey lying headless and nameless on the shore: *iacet ingens litore truncus | avulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus* (2.557-8).

[20] The key moment of *naming* comes at 8.793 when Cordus inscribes the tumulus with the words HIC SITUS EST MAGNUS. This passage stands as Lucan's direct rebuttal to Vergil's *sine nomine corpus* (2.558).

[21] This catalogue in the negative hearkens back to Lucan's description of the austere wedding between Cato and Marcia (2.350-91) which was similarly described in terms of what did not take place.

[22] 9.69-72: *quid porro tumulis opus est aut ulla requiris | instrumenta, dolor? non toto in pectore portas, | inpia, Pompeium? non imis haeret imago | visceribus? quaerat cineres uictura superstes.*

[23] Note the possible double meaning of *victura* from *vincere* as well as *vivere*, such that embedded in Cornelia's words lies the latent reading that those who seek out funeral memorials will not only live but *conquer*.

from a distance, still reveals to her something of Pompey when she turns to gaze upon it (*ignis adhuc aliquid Pharios de litore surgens | ostendit mihi, Magne, tui*, 74-5).

Cornelia next relays the last words of advice and strategy that Pompey had entrusted to her, and it is here that Lucan begins in earnest to signal the transformation of the civil war into a new conflict to be fought on different terms than that between Pompey and Caesar. She reveals Pompey's exhortation to his sons to continue the fight against Caesar after his death at all costs (9.84-95), but he urges them to use the "fame of his name" (*fama nominis*, 9.91-2) to reconstitute the army. This, however, just threatens to render the new war a reiteration of "Pompey against Caesar" which had just been fought. In fact, up to 9.95 the entire strategy centers completely upon the identity of Pompey and his descendants, even invoking the power of memory—of Pompey—to help them remain unconquered in their struggle (*tantum indomitos memoresque paterni | iuris habete animos*, 9.95-6). Then, just at this moment, Cornelia adds a final message that casts a wholly new vision: "It will be right to obey the command of one man, *if* he will establish a party for Libertas, and that man is Cato" (*uni parere decebit, | si faciet partes pro libertate, Catoni*, 9.96-7).

This is precisely what Cato does over the course of Book 9, charting a new path for the defeated to continue their resistance against the victor. Most scholarly attention is paid to Lucan's fantastic narrative of Cato's exploits in the Libyan desert against sandstorms, thirst, and of course the famous army of poisonous snakes (9.294-949), and deservedly so since these events occupy the bulk of Book 9. This chapter's focus, however, is upon the crucial but often-overlooked foundation layer of Roman *memoria* and memorial-building that Lucan weaves throughout the opening sections of this book

as an empowering element of this new, ongoing war Cato will lead.[24] Gnaeus Pompey in fact poses the first problem Cato must fact in reconstituting an army for Old Rome when he asks his brother Sextus if their father has indeed perished and carried "Roman affairs to the shades" (*an occidimus Romanaque Magnus ad umbras | abstulit?* 9.124-5). This use of *Romana* as an abstract substantive points to the central concern he and his fellow Romans have about the ongoing survival of Rome's identity. What he does not know is that Book 9 already opened with Pompey's *umbra* rising up again and coming to rest in Cato as the new leader of a renewed resistance to Caesar. It will now be Cato's task to revive the memory of Rome from the funeral pyre of its defeat, which is the very task accomplished by a *monumentum*.

It is in the midst of Cato's attempts to reconstitute his army as one fighting for *Roma* and *Libertas* that we find the greatest image of memory's power to bring back life in Book 9. Cornelia conducts a grand *funus* ceremony for Pompey despite the lack of a body, using instead all the collected emblems of his past victories. All her fellow Romans, scattered up and down the Libyan shore, then follow her stirring "example of piety" and start erecting their own empty funeral pyres. The result is that the whole shore soon gleams with a mass re-enactment of Cornelia's funeral *exemplum*, but these countless individual *funera* go further and commemorate not Pompey alone but all those who fell at Pharsalus:

> …toto litore busta
> surgunt Thessalicis reddentia manibus ignem.
> sic, ubi depastis summittere gramina campis

[24] A full analysis of Cato's words and deeds over the whole of Book 9 is important for understanding his character, but such a detailed study would require numerous other chapters that extend beyond the scope of this dissertation. The study of Cato in Book 9 that falls closest to my general views is that of Stover (2008) who argues that Cato and his fight for *libertas* are the reason Lucan keeps writing after Book 7 and Caesar's victory; he does not engage Cato's relationship to his role as a preserver of memory, however.

> et renovare parans hibernas Apulus herbas
> igne fovet terras, simul et Garganus et arva
> Vulturis et calidi lucent buceta Matini. (9.180-185)

> …all along the shore funeral flames arise, offering up fire for those who fell in Thessaly, just like when an Apulian, preparing to revive the grasses in his exhausted pastures and renew the winter forage, nourishes the land with fire, and all in unison they blaze forth light: Gargano, the meadows of Vulturê, and the hot fields of Matinata.

Lucan follows this mass community act of remembering immediately with an oft-overlooked but deeply significant simile that compares the funeral fires with those that a farmer might use to clear out a field to prepare it to be fruitful again. Specifically, Lucan connects commemorating the dead with the renewal of land and revival of life (*renovare…fovet terras*).[25] The clear implication of the simile is that in the presence of active remembering, the defeat of *Roma et Libertas* is not necessarily the end but rather can be the chance for a new beginning. Over the remainder of Book 9, it is Cato who leads the way as a living *exemplum* of his cause, taking his first steps toward fulfilling his goal to commemorate the dead and thereby bring renewal to the land once again through the power of memory. By the end of the book, we see that Cato has already begun to act on his first stated goal of commemorating the dead. His beneficial self-sacrifice must wait, however, until Utica. Although that event lies beyond the scope of the epic as Lucan left it to us, there is every reason to believe that Lucan was leading his epic up to that point as the moment when Cato becomes himself a funeral *monumentum* of Old Rome and her precious *libertas*.

---

[25] Note how in death, Pompey's memorialization has inverted his former inability to produce anything new (1.134). It is likely that Lucan's use of Matinum (9.185) here is a reference to Horace *C.* 1.28.3 where it is the location of the unburied Archytas who is appropriately in need of proper funeral commemoration (which the ode itself accomplishes). On the issues of memory in this ode, see Frischer (1984) and Leach (1998).

Caesar at Troy: the Duel of Memories

Cato sets the stage for the ongoing war of resistance in Lucan between *Libertas et Caesar*, but this resistance in Lucan extends beyond the figure of Cato to the nature of the epic itself. This comes out clearly in the final scene of Book 9 when the now-victorious Caesar makes an intentional side trip to the fabled ruins of Troy while pursuing Pompey through the Aegean (9.950-999).[26] Caesar cannot help but make a trip—a literal epic pilgrimage—to such a famous site, this *locus memoriae* teeming with memories of the people and deeds made famous by Homer and so many others after him. The location is even more significant considering that Troy can act in the Roman imagination as a kind of counterpart to Rome.[27] Here in this place, Caesar—so recently successful in the waging of civil war—faces an unexpected problem: he fails to recognize many of the monuments. We are told that every rock has a name (*nullum est sine nomine saxum*, 9.973), but Lucan's Caesar remains *inscius* (9.974) of so many. His ignorance lasts until an anonymous native steps into the story as a kind of tour guide and effectively brings these *nomina* back to life.

This passage illustrates yet again that the world of the past is always in danger of perishing unless someone will speak for it and revive it in our memories. Like all other things that have perished in this epic, Troy possesses many *umbras* and a *nomen* in need

[26] Much has been written on this important episode; studies I have found most useful include Green (1991); Hardie (1993: 107); Edwards (1996: 64); Rossi (2001); Narducci (2002: 177-80), Gowing (2005: 89-92), Tesoriero (2005).

[27] On Troy as a literary substitute for Rome, see Edwards (1996: 64), Rossi (2001: 315), Tesoriero (2005: 204). This cross-identification holds especially true in epic since Vergil's *Aeneid* so clearly placed the roots of Rome's foundations in the downfall of Troy.

of commemoration (9.963-964).[28] Not even the tangible monuments to the past are immune from the threat of *oblivio*, for we read that "even the ruins had perished" (*etiam periere ruinae*, 9.969). Yet the guide, essentially a stand-in for the poet himself, reminds us that *memoria* can overcome even this threat. Memory, however, is a fickle and changeable thing. As he tramples *inscius* amidst the rubble, Caesar does actually manage to recognize a few things (9.970-973), but as Rossi points out his memory is "deviously selective" in identifying only those things that glorify his own Julian *gens*.[29] He is seemingly happy to leave the other names mired in *oblivio* when they don't fit the story he himself is busy constructing. Lucan's native Trojan, however, intervenes to make sure that a fuller *memoria* is restored.[30] It is especially fitting that he appears just in time to forbid Caesar from trampling specifically the tomb of Hector (*Phryx incola manes | Hectoreos calcare vetat*, 9.976-977), thus making the native not merely a generalized protector of memory but specifically a commemorator of the dead.[31] In this epic story, Caesar is made the *victor*, but the poet will not allow this *victor* the final say in deciding how things get remembered. The name of Troy is such a *nomen memorabile* (9.964)

---

[28] Troy's *nomen* is even *memorabile* (9.964) and of all places should not be in danger of being forgotten, yet that is exactly the danger facing it in the presence of Caesar.

[29] Rossi (2001: 315, 320)

[30] This interpretation of the *incola* as helpful restorer of memory stands in contrast to Tesoriero's reading (2005: 210-11) who sees him portrayed "more like a guard than a guide," inasmuch as he "certainly has a local knowledge of the past, but betrays no sense that it has any relationship to the present or the future." The *incola*, however, does not need to express that relationship overtly, as his main purpose—like the *monumentum* itself—is to pass on the memory of what has passed away so that the audience can make those connections with the present and the future. Specifically here the incola's interference illustrates that Caesar's memory-trampling will not be allowed to go unopposed.

[31] Cf. Rossi (2001: 317). This *incola* thus carries on the task that Cato begun earlier in the book, and in essence shares in the same task as Lucan himself.

precisely because it had speakers for it, poets and others ever after who remembered it and retold the story again and again, thereby bringing the dead back to life.[32]

In the wake of the civil wars, Old Rome needs its own speaker for the dead. Up to Lucan's time, the Caesars themselves have been the main storytellers of the tale of the civil wars. Memory is one of the key shapers of identity, and thus one of the central keys to political and social power. Lucan knows very well that Caesar himself fashioned his own *memoria* of the civil wars by publishing his own commentaries on them, and Augustus after him is careful to explain through his *Res Gestae* that the legacy of the civil wars was his arrival on the scene to avenge a wronged Republic and restore its lost *libertas*.[33] The *Bellum Civile* proclaims, however, that *Caesar* now has a competitor in the arena of memory. It is with a note of triumph that the poet's own voice interrupts the narrative here at Troy to declare:

> venturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra
> vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo. (9.985-6)
>
> Those who will come in the future will read *both me and you*. Our "Pharsalia" will live, and we will be consigned to the forgetful shadows by no age.

Lucan's text sets forth a counter-memory to that provided by the Caesars by reaching further back to the roots of the civil conflict that spawned the progenitor of the Julio-Claudian *domini*.[34] This epic paints a very different picture of civil war's legacy by reminding people that whatever *libertas* Augustus claims to restore was absent *because*

---

[32] Cf. Tesoriero (2005: 207).

[33] *RG* 1, *rem publicam dominatione factionis opressam in libertatem vindicavi*.

[34] Gowing (2005: 95) recognizes this, writing that "the poem itself constitutes the greatest triumph of memory, restoring to the public conscience, to *collective* memory, an event that brought an end to the Republic."

the original Caesar was responsible for destroying it in the first place.[35] Lucan's counter-memory thus puts in front of his audience a counter-identity of Rome. By reading his monumental text his audience reenacts the death of the Old Rome, destroyed by the victory of the Caesars, and in so doing they must also reflect on the Rome that exists now in Lucan's own day and the meaning of what has been lost.

As we read Lucan, we should keep the funeral oration and the tomb inscription in our minds. Both *funera* and *monumenta* possess at their core a didactic force. As Elsner (1996: 35) observes on the *Res Gestae*, "The self-fashioning, indeed the fabrication, of the principate was achieved not only by the production of images but additionally by what were in effect written *instructions* on how those images should be interpreted and read."[36] Lucan's text thus offers an opposing set of written instructions. Reading this epic as a work that unites these central memory institutions together into a literary funeral *monumentum* suggests the intriguing possibility that in this epic of Rome's self-destruction Lucan might really be trying to catch the attention of his audience and invite them to think deeply about something—and then *to act*. Lucan cannot erase the historical fact of *Caesar*, but like the native at Troy he can offer a different story that commemorates the dead, restores their *nomen*, and gives them a voice once again to speak to the living. Lucan's epic funeral *monumentum* bids its audience to gaze upon it,

---

[35] Where Augustus describes his political position with the diplomatic *per consensum universorum potens* [or *potitus*] *rerum omnium* (*RG* 34), Lucan's description of Caesar at the first meeting of the half-absent Senate is stark and much more sinister: *omnia Caesar erat* (BC 3.108).

[36] Elsner (1996: 35).

ponder the death of *Roma et Libertas*, consider what the civil wars truly cost Rome, and finally respond however they will.[37]

What the Roman people face in Lucan's epic is the death of pre-Caesarian *Roma* and the *Libertas* that fell with her. What Lucan's contemporary audience faces is the question of how (or not) to remember. The trap threatened by civil war remains a threat but not yet a foregone conclusion for the reason that the ideological civil war found in Lucan has not yet been decided in this ongoing war of memory. How Old Rome is remembered (or not) will determine the real meaning of Rome's defeat in the civil war. If the people can remember and memorialize her, then she can continue to have life in a very real sense. If Old Rome is remembered, then she will continue to influence and inspire those who live on after her and thereby continue to shape Rome's future.[38] In this epic, Old Rome died on the plains of Pharsalus, and all anyone can do is sing her funeral and carve her headstone.

But this is precisely the point: the one certain weapon the defeated still have is the power of memory, and the power of memory is the power of continued life for the dead. Lucan's Cato keeps our attention on the fate of Rome and the demise of Libertas, while simultaneously pointing to the power of memory to give the dead life again. Death and defeat does not have to be the end. Through the creation of Lucan's epic, *memoria* has

---

[37] It is not my purpose to suggest what precise actions Lucan himself wanted his epic to inspire his audience to do, whether the restoration of the Republic, replacing Nero with a better *Caesar*, or something else entirely. The epic as we have it does not in fact give us enough to answer this question, but this is in any case not how funeral monuments function. The theme of Caesarian resistance suggests doing something with the restoration of *Libertas*, but I hesitate to go further than this. It is rather my intention to show that the rhetorical function of a Roman *exemplum* or *monumentum* (including the *Bellum Civile*) is to bring the past before a present audience and thereby inspire them to respond with future action.

[38] Cf. Le Goff (1996: 99) "Memory, on which history draws and which it nourishes in return, seeks to save the past in order to serve the present and the future. Let us act in such a way that collective memory may serve the liberation and not the enslavement of human beings." He is writing with regard to modern world history, but these are words that Lucan himself would well have agreed with.

returned and rescued the Rome which existed before the Caesars from the utter ruin of *oblivio*—at least for the moment. Yet, the duel of memories for Rome's past is not yet won. According to the *Bellum Civile*, this is the ongoing war that began with Cato and will continue up through the Neronian period and long into Rome's future. As Lucan might say: "Let the battle rage on."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahl, F. (1976). *Lucan. An Introduction*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Alexander, W. (1946). "Cato of Utica in the Works of Seneca Philosophus", *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 40, 2nd Ser., 59-74.

Arendt, Hannah. (1978). *The Life of the Mind – Thinking – Willing*. *Vol 1*. London: HJB Book.

Bartsch, Shadi. (2006). *The Mirror of the Self*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. (1998). *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Batstone, William and Damon, Cynthia. (2006). *Caesar's Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Becker, Lawrence. (2004). "Stoic Emotions," in Strange and Zupko (eds.), *Stoicism. Traditions and Transformations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 250-76.

Behr, A. (2007). *Feeling History. Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Benoist, S. (2007). *Mémoire et Histoire: Les procedures de condemnation dans l'Antiquité romaine*. Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorraine d'Histoire.

Billerbeck, M. (1985). "Stoizismus in der römischen Epik neronischer und flavischer Zeit', in Temporini and Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Romische Welt* II.32.5. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 3116-51.

Blair, W. (2004). *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914*. Chapel Hill: Univesity of North Carolina Press.

Bloomer, W.M. (1992). *Valerius Maximus & the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Braund, S. (2010). "Introduction," in Tesoriero (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Lucan.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-13.

Brena, Fabrizio. (1999). "Osservazioni al libro IX del *Bellum civile*," in Esposito and Nicastri (eds.), *Interpretare Lucano: Miscellanea Di Studi*. Napoli: Università degli studi di Salerno, 275-301.

Brennan, Tad. (2005). *The Stoic Life. Emotions, Duties, & Fate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brisset, Jacqueline. (1964). *Les Idées Politiques de Lucain*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Burgess, J.F. (1972). "Pietas in Virgil and Statius," *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* (11), 48-61.

Campbell, Ernest. (1969). "Death as a Social Practice," in Lison Mills (ed.), *Perspectives on Death*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Carroll, M. (2006). *Spirits of the Dead: Roman Funerary Commemoration in Western Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Casamento, Alfredo. (2005). *La Parola e La Guerra. Rappresentazioni Letterarie del* Bellum Civile *in Lucano*. Bologna: Pàtron Editore.

Chaplin, J. (2000). *Livy's Exemplary History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Citroni, M. (2003). *Memoria e Identità. La cultura romana costruisce la sua imagine*. Firenze: Università degli Studi di Firenze.

Coffee, Neil. (2009). *The Commerce of War. Exchange and Social Order in Latin Epic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Conte, G.B. (1966). "Il proemio della Pharsalia", *Maia* 18, 42-53.

_____. (1994). *Latin Literature. A History*. Trans. Joseph Solodow (original pub.1987). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Corbier, M. (2006). *Donner À Voir, Donner À Lire: Mémoir et communication dans la Rome ancienne*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.

Courtney, E. (2001). *A Companion to Petronius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Croisille, J.-M. (1982). "Caton et Sénèque face au pouvoir: Lucain, *Pharsale*, 2.234-325; 9.186-217," in Croisille and Fauchère (eds.), *Neronia 1977*. Adosa, 75-82.

De Nadaï, Jean-Christophe. (2000). *Rhétorique et poétique dans la Pharsale de Lucain. La crise de la representation dans la poésie antique*. Leuven: Peeters.

Dempsey, K.A. (1961). *A Literary Estimate of Marcus Porcius Cato Uticensis*. Dissertation, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

Dewar, M. (1994). "Laying it on with a Trowel: The Proem to Lucan and Related Texts," *Classical Quarterly* 44, 199-211.

Dick, B.F. (1967). "Fatum and Fortuna in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*," *Classical Philology* 62, 235-42.

Dilke, O.A.W. (1972). "Lucan's Political Views and the Caesars," in D.R. Dudley (ed.) *Neronians and Flavians: Silver Latin I*. London: Routledge, 62-82.

Duff, J.W. (1927). *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons.

Duffalo, B. (2007). *The Ghosts of the Past: Latin Literature, the Dead, and Rome's Transition to a Principate*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Dunbabin, K. (2003). The *Roman Banquet: Images of Conviviality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eder, Walter. (2005). "Augustus and the Power of Tradition," in Karl Galinsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, C. (1996). *Writing Rome. Textual Approaches to The City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2007). *Death in Ancient Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Elsner, J. (1996). "Inventing imperium: texts and the propaganda of monuments in Augustan Rome", in J. Elsner (ed.), *Art And Text in Roman Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 32-53.

Emilie, Gertrude. (1944). "Cicero and the Roman Pietas," *Classical Journal* 39.9, 536-42.

Erasmo, Mario. (2008). *Reading Death in Ancient Rome*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Esposito, P. and Nicastri, L. (1999). *Interpretare Lucano. Miscellanea di Studi*. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Salerno.

Esposito, P. and Ariemma, E.M., eds. (2004). *Lucano e la tradizione dell'epica latina*. Napoli: Guida.

Fantham, E. (1992). *De Bello Civili. Book 2*. Text and Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1999). "Lucan and the Republican Senate," in Esposito and Nicastri (eds.), *Interpretare Lucano. Miscallanea di Studi*. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Salerno, 109-25.

Farrell, J. (1997). "The Phenomenology of Memory in Roman Culture", *Classical Journal* 92.4: 373-83.

Feldherr, Andrew. (1998). *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Feeney, D. (1991). *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of The Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fehrle, Rudolf. (1983). *Cato Uticensis*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Flower, H. (1996). *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2004). "Spectacle and Political Culture in The Roman Republic", in H. Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to The Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 322-343.

_____. (2006). *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Foley, J.M. (2004). "Epic as genre", in R. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 171-187.

Flume, H. (1950). "*Die Einheit die künsterlichen Persönlichkeit Lucans*," in Rutz (ed. 1970), 296-8.

Fraenkel, Eduard. (1924). "Lucan as the Transmitter of Ancient Pathos," trans. from German in Tesoriero (ed. 2010), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Lucan.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 15-45.

Friedrich, W.H. (1938). "Cato, Caesar, und Fortuna bei Lucan," *Hermes* 78, 391-423.

Frischer, Bernard. (1984). "Horace and the Monuments: A New Interpretation of the Archytas Ode (C.1.28)," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 88, 71-102.

George, David. (1991). "Lucan's Cato and Stoic Attitudes to the Republic," *Classical Antiquity* 10, 237-58.

Getty, Robert. (1940). *Lucan. De Bello Civili I*. Reprint, London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992.

Goar, R. (1987). *The Legend of Cato Uticensis from the First Century B.C. to the Fifth Century A.D.* Collection Latomus 197. Bruxelles: Latomus.

Gorman, V. (2001). "Lucan's Epic Aristeia and The Hero of The *Bellum Civile*", *Classical Journal* 96.3, 263-290.

Gotoff, Harold. (1971). *The Transmission of the Text of Lucan in the Ninth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gourevitch, P. (1999). *We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed With Our Families: Stories from Rwanda*. New York: Macmillan.

Gowing, A. (2000). "Memory and Silence in Cicero's *Brutus*", *Eranos* 98: 39-64.

_____. (2005). *Empire And Memory: the representation of the Roman Republic in imperial culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gradel, Ittai. (2005). *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Green, C. (1991). "*Stimulos Dedit Aemula Virtus*: Lucan and Homer Reconsidered", *Phoenix* 45: 230–254.

Griffin, Miriam. (1976). *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Griset, E. (1954). "Lucanea II: I proemi", *Rivista di Studi Classici* 2, 185-190.

Halbwachs, M. (1950). *La mémoire collective*. Paris: La Presse Universitaire de France. (= *On Collective Memory* (1992), trans. L.A. Coser)

Hardie, P. (1993). *The Epic Successors of Virgil. A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hardy, Robert. (1991). *The Uses of Memory in the Poetry of Vergil*. Dissertation, Brown University.

Heitland, W.E. (1887). "Introduction" in C.E. Haskins (ed.), *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*. London: George Bell and Sons.

Henderson, John. (1987). "Lucan: The Word at War," *Ramus* 16, 122-64.

_____. (1998). *Fighting for Rome. Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Henry, Elisabeth. (1989). *The Vigour of Prophecy. A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Herrmann, L. (1947). "Le Prologue de la *Pharsale*", *Latomus* 6, 91-94.

Hershkowitz, D. (1998). *The Madness of Epic: Reading Insanity from Homer to Statius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Hill, T. (2004). *Ambitiosa Mors. Suicide and Self in Roman Thought and Literature*. New York: Routledge.

Hope, V. and Marshall, E., eds. (2000). *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*. New York: Routledge.

Hope, Valerie. (2000). "Contempt and Respect: The Treatment of the Corpse in Ancient Rome", in Hope and Marshall (eds.), 104-127.

_____. (2007). *Death in Ancient Rome: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge.

Hunink, Vincent. (1992). *Lucan's Bellum Civile Book III*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

_____. (2002). Review of Esposito and Nicastri (1999). *Classical Review* 52.1, 68-70.

_____. (2003). Review of De Nadaï (2000). *Mnemosyne* 56.1, 106-8.

Inwood, B. and Gerson, L.P. (1997). *Hellenistic Philosophy. Introductory Readings*. 2nd ed.

Jaeger, M. (1997). *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Janssen, L.F. (1981). "Some Unexplored Aspects of Devotio Deciana," *Mnemosyne* 34, 357-381.

Johnson, W.R. (1987). *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and His Heroes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Joyce, Jane Wilson. (1982). *Time as an Emotive Factor in Lucan's "Pharsalia."* Dissertation, University of Texas.

_____. (1993). *Lucan. Pharsalia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

King, Charles. (1998). *The Living and the Dead: Ancient Roman Conceptions of the Afterlife*. Dissertation, University of Chicago.

Konstan, David. (2005). "Clemency as a Virtue," *Classical Philology* 100.4, 337-46.

Koortbojian, M. (1996). "*In commemorationem mortuorum*: Text and Image along the 'Streets of Tombs'", in J. Elsner (ed.), *Art And Text in Roman Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kumaniecki, K. (1970). "Ciceros Cato," in Walter Himmel (ed.), *Forschungen zur römischen Literatur, Festschrift zum 60 Geburtstag von Karl Büchner*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Lapidge, M. (1979). "Lucan's Imagery of Cosmic Dissolution," *Hermes* 107, 344-70.

Larmour, D.H.J. (2007). "Holes in the body: Sites of abjection in Juvenal's Rome," in Larmour and Spencer (eds.), *The Sites of Rome. Time, Space, Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 168-210.

Lausberg, Marion. (1985). "Lucan und Homer", in Temporini and Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Romische Welt* II.32.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1565-1622.

Le Goff, J. (1996). *History and Memory*. Trans. Rendall and Claman. New York: Columbia University Press.

Leach, Eleanor. (1998). "Personal and Communal Memory in the Reading of Horace's *Odes*, Books 1-3," *Arethusa* 31.1, 43-74.

Lebek, Wolfgang. (1976). *Lucans Pharsalia. Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug.* Hypomnemata 44. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Leigh, Matthew. (1997). *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levi, M. (1949). "Il Prologo della 'Pharsalia'", *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 27, 71-78.

Levy, D. and Sznaider, N. (2006). *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*. Trans. A. Oksiloff. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lindsay, H. (1998). "Eating With The Dead: The Roman Funerary Banquet", in I. Nielsen and H. Sigismund Nielsen (eds.), *Meals in a Social Context. Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 67-80.

_____. (2000). "Death-Pollution and Funerals in the City of Rome", in Hope and Marshall (eds.), 152-173.

Lintott, Andrew. (1971). "Lucan and the History of Civil War", *Classical Quarterly* 21, 488-505.

Litchfield, H. (1914). "National *Exempla Virtutis* in Roman Literature", *HSCP* 25, 1-71.

Long, A.A. (1986). *Hellenistic Philosophy. Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Long, A.A. and Sedley, D.N. (1987). *The Hellenistic Philosophers. Volume 1 – Translations of the principal sources with philosophical commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loupiac, A. (1998). *La poétique des éléments dans La Pharsale de Lucain*. Collection Latomus 241. Bruxelles: Société d'études latines.

Luce, T.J. (1990). "Livy, Augustus and the Forum Augustum," in Toher and Raaflaub (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 123-38.

MacDonald, Ronald. (1987). *The Burial-Places of Memory: Epic Underworlds in Vergil, Dante, and Milton*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Malcovati, E. (1951). "Sul prologo della Farsaglia", *Athenaeum* 29, 100-108.

Marin, Pamela. (2009). *Blood in the Forum: The Struggle for the Roman Republic*. London: Continuum.

Marti, B. (1945). "The Meaning of the *Pharsalia*", *American Journal of Philology* 66.4, 352-376.

_____. (1975). "Lucan's Narrative Techniques", *Parola del Passato* 30, 74-90.

Martindale, C. (1984). "The Politician Lucan," *Greece & Rome* 31, 64-79.

_____. (1993). *Redeeming The Text: Latin Poetry and The Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, R. Lucan. (1981). *Lucan. Civil War VIII.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Meban, D. (2002). *Essays in Virgilian Intertextuality: Text, Culture, Context*. Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Metger, W. (1957). *Kampf und Tod in Lucans Pharsalia*. Dissertation, Albrechts-Universität Kiel.

Miles, G. (1995). *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Morford, Mark. (1967a). *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (1967b). "The Purpose of Lucan's Ninth Book", *Latomus* 26, 123-129.

Narducci, E. (1979). *La provvidenza crudele. Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei*. Pisa: Giardini.

_____. (1985). "Ideologia e tecnica allusive nella Pharsalia", in Temporini and Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Romische Welt* II.32.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1538-64.

_____. (1999). "Deconstructing Lucan," in Esposito and Nicastri (eds.), *Interpretare Lucano. Miscallanea di Studi*. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Salerno, 39-83.

_____. (2001). "Catone in Lucano (e alcune interpretazioni recenti)," *Athenaeum* 89, 171-86.

_____, E. (2002). *Lucano. Un'epica contro l'impero. Interpretazione della* Pharsalia. Roma: Laterza.

Neal, A. (2005). *National Trauma and Collective Memory: Extraordinary Events in the American Experience*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.

Nock, A.D. (1926). "The Proem in Lucan", *Classical Review* 40, 17-18.

O'Hara, James. (2007). *Inconsistency in Roman Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, D. (1993). *Consolatory Rhetoric: Grief, Symbol, and Ritual in the Greco-Roman Era*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Opelt, I. (1957). "Die Seeschlacht von Massilia bei Lucan," *Hermes* 85, 435-45.

Osgood, J. (2006). *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paratore, E. (1992). *Lucano. Filologia e Critica*. Roma: Ateneo.

Perkell, Christine. (1999). "Aeneid 1: An Epic Program," in Perkell (ed.), *Reading Vergil's* Aeneid*. An Interpretive Guide*. Norman: Oklahoma City, 29-49.

Pichon, René. (1912). *Les Sources de Lucain*. Paris: Leroux.

Quint, David. (1993). *Epic and Empire. Politics and Generic Form From Virgil to Milton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Radicke, Jan. (2004). *Lucans poetische Technik. Studien zum historischen Epos*. Leiden: Brill.

Raschle, Christian Rudolf. (2001). *Pestes Harenae: Die Schlangenepisode in Lucans Pharsalia (IX 587-949). Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 130. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Rea, J. (2007). *Legendary Rome: Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline*. London: Duckworth.

Reydams-Schils, G. (2005). *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ricoeur, P. (2004). *Memory, History, Forgetting.* Trans. Blamey and Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rist, John. (1969). *Stoic Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1978). "The Stoic Concept of Detachment" in Rist (ed.), *The Stoics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 259-272.

Roche, Paul. (2005). "Righting the Reader: Conflagration and Civil War in Lucan's *De Bello Civili*," *Scholia* 14, 52-71.

Rossi, A. (2001). "Remapping the Past: Caesar's Tale of Troy (Lucan *BC* 9.964-999)", *Phoenix* 55: 313-326.

Rowland, R.W. (1969). "The Significance of Massilia in Lucan", *Hermes* 97, 204-8.

Rudich, Vasaly. (1997). *Dissidence and Literature Under Nero. The Price of Rhetoricization*. London: Routledge.

Russo, Peter. (1974). *Marcus Porcius Cato Uticensis: A Political Reappraisal*. Dissertation, Rutgers University.

Rutz, Werner (ed.). (1970). *Lucan*. Wege der Forschung 235. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

_____. (1979). "Die 'Pharsalia' Lucans" in E. Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos*, Darmstadt, 154-199.

_____. (1985). "Lucans 'Pharsalia' im Lichte der neuesten Forschung," in Wolfgang Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 32.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1457-1537.

Salemme, C. (2002). *Lucano: La Storia Verso La Rovina*. Napoli: Loffredo Editore.

Saller, Richard. (1996). *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scheid, J. (2007). *Res gestae divi Augusti. Hauts faits du divin Auguste*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Schmitt, Andreas. (1995). *Die Direkten Reden der Massen in Lucans* Pharsalia. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Schotes, H.A. (1969). *Stoische Physik, Psychologie und Theologie bei Lucan*. Dissertation, Bonn.

Scullard, H.H. (1981). *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Seewald, Martin. (2008). *Studien zum 9. Buch von Lucans* Bellum Civile*. Mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1-733*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Sklenář, R. (1999). "Nihilistic Cosmology and Catonian Ethics in 'Lucan's *Bellum Civile*," *American Journal of Philology* 120, 281-96.

_____. (2003). *The Taste for Nothingness. A Study of Virtus and Related Themes in Lucan's* Bellum Civile. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Slater, N. (2008). "Orality and Autobiography: The Case of the *Res Gestae*", in E. Mackay (ed.) *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*. Mnemosyne Supplementa 298. Leiden: Brill, 253-273.

Small, J. Penny and Tatum, J. (1995). "Memory and the Study of Classical Antiquity", *Helios* 22.2: 149-77.

Snell, Antony. (1939). "*Lucan*," *Greece & Rome* 8 (23), 83-91.

Spencer, D. (2005). "Lucan's Follies: Memory and Ruin in a Civil-War Landscape", *Greece & Rome* 52.1: 46-69.

Stover, Tim. (2008). "Cato and the Intended Scope of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*," *Classical Quarterly* 58.2, 571-580.

Sullivan, J.P. (1985). *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Sumi, G. (2005). *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Terdiman, R. (1993). *Present Past: Modernity and The Memory Crisis*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Tasler, Wolfgang. (1972). *Die Reden in Lucans Pharsalia*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag.

Tesoriero, C. (2005). "Trampling Over Troy: Caesar, Vergil, Lucan," in Christine Walde (ed.), *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig: K.G. Saur.

_____. (ed.). (2010). *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Lucan.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Toher, Mark. (2006). "The Earliest Depiction of Caesar and the Later Tradition," in Maria Wyke (ed.), *Julius Caesar in Western Culture*. Malden: Blackwell, 29-44.

Tommasi Moreschini, Chiara. (2005). "Lucan's Attitude towards Religion: Stoicism vs. Provincial Cults," in Christine Walde (ed.), *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig: K.G. Saur.

Toohey, Peter (2000). "Picturing Nero," review of Schubert, *Studien zum Nerobild in der Lateinischen Dichtung der Antike*. *Classical Review* 50.2, 449-51.

Toynbee, M.C. (1971). *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Tracy, Jonathan. (2009). *Science, Egypt, and Escapism in Lucan*. Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Tschiedel, H.J. (1981). *Caesars Anti-Cato. Eine Untersuchung der Testimonien und Fragmente*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Van Campen, F.H.M. (1991). *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili liber II. Een commentaar.* Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

Versnel, H.S. (1976). "Two Types of Roman Devotio," *Mnemosyne* (29), 365-410.

_____. (1980). "Self-sacrifice, Compensation, and the Anonymous Gods," in Jean Rudhardt and Olivier Reverdin (eds.), *Le Sacrifice dans l'Antiquité*. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 27. Vandœuvres–Genève: Fondations Hardt, 135-185.

Vögler, Gudrun. (1968). "Das neunte Buch innerhalb der Pharsalia des Lucan und die Frage der Vollendung des Epos," *Philologus* 112, 222-68.

Wagenvoort, Hendrik. (1980). *Pietas: Selected Studies in Roman Religion*. Leiden: Brill.

Walde, Christine. (2005). *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*. München: K.G. Saur.

Walker, Susan. (1985). *Memorials to the Roman Dead*. London: British Museum Publications.

Walter, U. (2004). *Memoria und Res Publica: Zur Geschichtskultur im Republikanischen Rom*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Antike.

Werner, Shirley. (1994). "On the History of the Commenta Bernensia and the Adnotationes Super Lucanum," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 96, 343-68.

Wick, Claudia. (2004). *Bellum Civile Liber IX. Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung*. Two volumes. München: K.G. Saur.

Wildberger, J. (2005). "Stoizismen als Mittel der Verfremdung" in C. Walde (ed.), *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*. München: K.G. Saur, 56-88.

Wirszubski, C. (1950). *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome During the Late Republic and Early Principate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wuilleumier, P. and Henri Le Bonniec. (1962). *Bellum Civile. Liber Primus*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Zanker, P. (1988). *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. Alan Shipiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.