

*CONCORDIA DISCORDS* OR POMPEY LIKE CAESAR:  
LUCAN'S APOSTROPHES V 472–475, VI 278–332 AND THEIR CONTEXT

By

MARIUSZ PLAGO

In her important book, *Ideology in Cold Blood*, Shadi BARTSCH analyses Lucan's apostrophes and states that in the first two books of the poem "there are only small touches of narratorial favor on Pompey among general doom, but as the epic progresses their frequency and intensity increase". The narrator, especially in the apostrophes, seems to forget about his own previous portrait of Pompey, the events in the story and the actions and words of his character (BARTSCH 1997: 78). This view slightly oversimplifies the problem of the narrator's voice. By briefly analysing two passages from Book V and VI, I shall try to supplement the observations made by BARTSCH.

One of the most important features of Lucan's poem is the degree of the perceptibility of the narrator. He does not attempt to hide behind the narrated events, as in a typical epic narration, usually referred to as a third-person, authorial narration (in STANZEL's typology) or an extradiegetic and heterodiegetic narration (GENETTE's terminology). In comparison with his predecessors, Homer, Apollonius, Virgil or Ovid, Lucan's narrator frequently becomes visible as "I". The primary means through which the "I" is revealed is the apostrophe<sup>1</sup>, i.e. turning away from the proper audience ("auersus quoque a iudice sermo...", Quint. IX 2, 38). The establishing of "you" is also the establishing of "I". The narrator addresses not only his characters, but also other elements of the presented world – almost everything<sup>2</sup>. He often uses the apostrophe as a direct commentary on the events of the story, becoming intrusive and invasive. Nearly every significant segment of the narration is closed with this figure of speech<sup>3</sup>. In this way, the

---

<sup>1</sup> With only slight exaggeration we might say that the apostrophes are discussed in nearly every monograph and paper about Lucan's poem. Most recently, see. e.g. FABER 2005; D'ALESSANDRO BEHR 2007; ASSO 2008.

<sup>2</sup> FABER (2005: 338): "This range of uses and contexts lends complexity to the narrator's voice".

<sup>3</sup> On this structural function of apostrophe, see FABER 2005: 338 f.

basic communication between the narrator and the narratee is undermined. Yet, the apostrophe always has two addressees; the one invoked directly, and, as an element of a larger structure, the addressee or addressees of the entire poem<sup>4</sup>. The narrator assumes the role of a poet from the times of Nero and describes the events from this perspective. He emphasizes their significance, the results they produce for himself and his audience<sup>5</sup>. Due to the metaleptic<sup>6</sup> nature of the apostrophe, the presented world is closely connected with the world of the narrator and his narratee<sup>7</sup>. Through the apostrophes, both worlds create a continuum, an indissoluble whole, where the past the narrator addresses also becomes a present.

The apostrophes listed in the title, which delimitate the segments of the poem (V 461–475 and VI 263–332), constitute an explicit narratorial interpretation of the characters and events. However, we may also find other evaluative and commentative elements in these passages. An important role is played by verbal echoes and internal references (which has been stressed by BARTSCH too<sup>8</sup>). Poetic imagery is of great significance as well, especially similes and metaphors, which form implicit commentary and model the narrator's portrait of Pompey. This layer of the text is ignored by BARTSCH and many other scholars, who mainly focus on the apostrophes themselves. When we take into account all these components of the interpretative activity, the voice of the narrator and thus the image of Pompey become more complex. The narrator (a partisan narrator according to BARTSCH), praising and whitening his hero on the surface of the text, in the background makes an effort to remind his audience of Pompey who was introduced in the arena of struggle at the beginning of the poem, especially in the *synkrisis* of both leaders. This is Pompey seen through the eyes of Cato and the Romans in book two, Pompey whose goals are the same as Caesar's.

#### APOSTROPHE V 472–475

Book V opens with an assembly of senators on Pompey's side, during which he was officially elected leader. In this book the narrator also describes Caesar's

---

<sup>4</sup> For more details about this phenomenon see KORTE 1987; KACANDES 1994: 330 f.; on Lucan, see ASSO 2008: 162 f.

<sup>5</sup> This function is particularly emphasized by ROCHE 2009: 112 (discussing the apostrophe to Rome at I 8–32).

<sup>6</sup> Metalepsis is a term coined by GENETTE (1988: 234 f.): "The transition from one narrative level to another can in principle be achieved only by the narrating, the act that consists precisely of introducing into one situation, by means of discourse, the knowledge of another situation. Any other form of transit is, if not always impossible, at any rate always transgressive. [...] We will extend the term *narrative metalepsis* to all this transgression". On metalepsis in ancient Greek literature, see DE JONG 2009.

<sup>7</sup> DE JONG 2009: 96 (esp. Homer); WILLIAMS 1983: 186 (Virgil); FABER 2005: 341 f.

<sup>8</sup> BARTSCH (1997: 82) on the apostrophe VII 207–213. Cf. VII 212 f. with II 320 ff. (Cato's words) and VIII 322: "Roma, faue coeptis" (Pompey's words which repeat Caesar's I 200; it has been noted by AHL 1976: 171 f.).

departure from Italy to Greece. Both rivals stood opposite each other for the first time since Pompey's escape from Brundisium. Giving information that the camps were pitched in close proximity to each other, the narrator does not refrain, as usually, from making a comment in the form of an apostrophe, and in this way he closes the passage about Caesar's arrival in Greece (V 403–475). He addresses Pompey. This is only the third apostrophe directly addressed to this hero – following the apostrophes in the *synkrisis* (I 121–123) and at the end of Book II (725–736):

hoc fortuna loco tantae duo nomina famae  
 conposuit, miserique fuit spes inrita mundi  
 posse duces parua campi statione diremptos  
 admotum damnare nefas; nam cernere uoltus  
 et uoces audire datur, multosque per annos  
 dilectus tibi, Magne, socer post pignora tanta,  
 sanguinis infausti subolem mortemque nepotum,  
 te nisi Niliaca propius non uidit harena. (V 468–475)

The interpretation of these lines is usually pro-Pompeian. For instance McROBERTS<sup>9</sup> analyzes them as an example in which the winner of the battle of Pharsalus is attacked implicitly. According to this view, the narrator underscores Pompey's feelings (*pietas*) for Caesar over many years and highlights Caesar's lack of proper love for his son-in-law<sup>10</sup>. Only Caesar's murderous greed of power will shatter the chance for any reconciliation or peace. Anyway, the next section of narration begins with clear accusation:

Caesaris attonitam miscenda ad proelia mentem  
 ferre moras scelerum partes iussere relictæ. (V 476 f.)

He cannot stand forced inactivity and he is impatient for the crime to happen – it is a leitmotiv introduced in Book I, in the *synkrisis* of Pompey and Caesar<sup>11</sup>.

The narrator, after going back to the times when the leaders were a family, suddenly jumps into the future, articulating his sadness at the death of Pompey. Despite the fact that the armies have come head-to-head, Caesar will see his son-in-law in Egypt. The narrator deftly expresses grief for Pompey's eventual doom and subtly prepares the readers for Caesar's false show of tears upon the

<sup>9</sup> McROBERTS 2005: 40 f. ("the sympathetic apostrophe of Pompey..."). See also BARTSCH 1997: 97; D'ALESSANDRO BEHR 2007: 83 f.

<sup>10</sup> The concept of *pietas* in the *Civil War* in the context of the war between Caesar and Pompey, his son-in-law, is discussed by BANNON 1997: 151–153. For the '*socer – gener*' theme, see esp. VIANINO 1974: 9–15.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. I 183 f.; I 392 ff.; II 439 ff.; II 650 ff., etc. For this leitmotiv, see esp. ROSNER-SIEGEL 1983.

presentation of Pompey's head, as his false tears will in fact be a sign of joy (IX 1035–1043). It is Caesar who bears responsibility for the continuity of the war.

Such interpretation is generally correct. However, it takes into consideration only one, literal level of the text taken out of context, while completely ignoring the narrator's references to his previous statements in the apostrophe itself and in the immediately preceding lines. When we take these into account, the apostrophe gains a new dimension. It is difficult to undermine the narrator's negative attitude towards Caesar, which is very clear, although not directly expressed. But his bias in favour of Pompey is rather illusory. The figure of Pompey in this passage, as in the whole poem, is very ambiguous.

The passage between the landing of Caesar in Epirus (“[classis] iam uento fluctuque secundo/ lapsa Palaestinas uncis confixit harenas”, 459 f.) and his actions (476 ff.) consists of the description of the place, *ekphrasis topou* (V 461–467), where the two camps were very close together so that their leaders could hear and see each other, the portrayal of the world's reaction to this situation and the narrator's explicit commentary ending with our apostrophe, which is also an internal narrative prolepsis. The first part of this passage is limited to the description of two rivers. Using aquatic symbolism<sup>12</sup>, the narrator, as elsewhere in the poem, transforms this *ekphrasis* also into an implicit commentary not only on the actions of the adversaries, but also on the leaders' personalities and their goals. Geography reflects a situation which exists in the human world:

prima duces iunctis uidit consistere castris  
 tellus, quam uolucer Genusus, quam mollior Hapsus  
 circumeunt ripis. Hapso gestare carinas  
 causa palus, leni quam fallens egerit unda;  
 at Genusum nunc sole niues nunc imbre solutae  
 praecipitant. neuter longo se gurgite lassat,  
 sed minimum terrae uicino litore nouit. (V 461–467)

Genusus is swift (*uolucer*), Hapsus slower (*mollior*); the phrase “quam uolucer Genusus, quam mollior Hapsus” is then elaborated (in a chiasmic structure): one moves lazily (*leni unda*), flowing from a swamp and carrying ships; and the other rushes down (*praecipitant*)<sup>13</sup>, swollen with melting snow. The forces are in the camps now, but this description, as I pointed out earlier, foreshadows

<sup>12</sup> For this symbolism, see esp. MASTERS 1992: 51–53 (the analysis of the description of Ilerda, IV 11 ff.), 169–172.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of these lines, see ROSNER-SIEGEL 1983: 173. Cf. the beginning of the narrative of the action of Caesar in Brundisium: “Caesar in omnia praeceps” (II 656); *praeceps* also appears in the account of Caesar's march to Dyrrachium: “Dyrrachii praeceps rapiendas tendit ad arcis” (VI 14). This epithet occurs with reference to Caesar also in II 489; III 50 f.; IX 47 f.; see NEWMYER 1983: 238 f. For the opposition “fast – slow” which characterizes Caesar and Pompey, see SCHÖNBERGER 1960: 87; 1961: 50 f.; NEWMYER 1983: 229 f. (the analysis of the *synkrisis*) and passim; ROSNER-SIEGEL 1983.

their future actions and at the same time refers to the image of our two leaders which emerges from the famous *synkrisis* in Book I, both to the characterization of inactive Pompey, ending with his comparison to an aged decaying oak laden with trophies and gifts (we may even liken “gestare carinas” to “exuuias ueteris populi sacrataque gestans/ dona ducum”, I 137 f.), and to the portrait of Caesar, as quick and unstoppable as lightning which allows nothing to stand in the way of its progress. In this way, the narrator invokes the whole symbolism of those lines, which is clearly negative towards Caesar, but as far as Pompey is concerned, it is equivocal. On the one hand he is the shade of Aeneas (who is also compared to an oak tree, but he is a deep-rooted tree resisting the full force of the Alpine winds, IV 441–446)<sup>14</sup> and the old and dying Republic, and on the other he has the same goal as Caesar, the same unlimited desire of power. It is worth remembering the opening lines of the *synkrisis*:

nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarue priorem  
 Pompeiusue parem. quis iustius induit arma  
 scire nefas... (I 125–127)

However, Pompey is doomed to be defeated because his glory is a thing of the past.

The following lines (the information about the shortness of the rivers caused by of the proximity of the sea) form a frame with the opening sentence of *ek-phrasis*. Due to the process of anthropomorphization (*lassat, nouit*), they are a smooth transition from geography to the human world, the here and now in the story, that is the camps separated from each other with a small space. The phrase “minimum terrae nouit” gains additional meaning in this context – at the human level the two leaders are fully aware of the ensuing situation. The geographical symbolism and references to the *synkrisis* affect also the meaning of the phrase “tantae duo nomina famae” (468), and remind the audience on what Pompey’s and Caesar’s fame relies (“famae petitor”, I 131, “magni nominis umbra”, I 135 ~ “sed non in Caesare tantum/ nomen erat nec fama ducis”, I 143 f.). Again, the man, the old oak of the great past versus the lightning which strikes terror into men’s hearts, real *fama* versus just *nomen*<sup>15</sup>.

Next, the narrator introduces a motif of recognition. A typical scene of recognition appears in Book IV (169–182)<sup>16</sup>. The proximity of the camps gives the

<sup>14</sup> For Pompey as Aeneas see esp. ROSSI 2000.

<sup>15</sup> For Pompey as *nomen*, see esp. FEENEY 1986b (discussion of the lines from the *synkrisis*: “... his name is ‘Magnus’, so that he is the shadow of his own name”, p. 239). Various readings of “non [...] tantum” are analyzed by ROCHE 2009: ad 143–144).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. III 326–329; IV 24–28; 158–180; VII 460–469 (before the battle of Pharsalus); see BAN-  
NON 1997: 152 f. (on the lines from Book VII); LEIGH 1997: 46–48; SCHLONSKI 1995: 29 f. (on IV  
169 ff.).

soldiers of Afranius and Petreius an opportunity to see and hear each other. They understood the crime (“deprensus est ciuile nefas”, 172), and love makes them to cross the ramparts (“rupit amor leges, audet transcendere uallum/ miles”, 175 f.) bringing about a reconciliation between the two conflicting sides: “hospitis ille ciet nomen, uocat ille propinquum” (177). Once more, such scene occurs just before the battle of Pharsalus (VII 460–469). The emphasis is put on family ties – a brother looks at his brother, the sons at their father (“uidere parentum/ frontibus aduersis fraternaue comminus arma”, VII 464 f.), and *pietas* prevents them from slaughter (“gelidusque in uiscera sanguis/ percussa pietate coit”, 467 f.).

Here, in Book V, the narrator plays with this conventional theme and with the expectations of his audience. All conditions for reconciliation have been met – the two leaders stand almost face to face and are bound by family ties<sup>17</sup>. First of all, the narrator returns to the sin of the civil war, introduced at the very beginning of the poem (“commune nefas”, I 6). The World had futile hopes that the rivals, who then could see and hear each other, would abandon the war (“damnare nefas” ~ IV 172, quoted above). This does not happen. Neither of them, this fact needs to be underlined, decides to stop fighting. The *nefas* motif is an accusation of both leaders. In the eyes of the World Caesar and Pompey are very much the same – both *duces* are now committing crimes (*nefas*). Moreover, the depiction of vain hopes of the people undoubtedly refers the audience to Book II, to the passage presenting the reaction of the Romans, soldiers, women and old men, to the war; they all sense a tyranny approaching and for them both leaders are alike.

The narrator now enters with an apostrophe and reminds the audience of their family bonds, which should induce them to end the conflict (as in Book IV and VII *amor* and *pietas* compel their soldiers to stop the fighting for a moment). The narrator’s defence of Pompey is strange – it incriminates both leaders even more at the same time. If these lines blame Caesar, they also blame his son-in-law. After Crassus’ death the only person who was stopping them when they wanted to fight was Julia. In the same apostrophe the narrator mentions her and by verbal echoes (V 473 f. ~ I 111 f.), withdraws outside the *synkrisis* to the description of the alliance, a short peace destroyed finally by the death of Caesar’s daughter. The leaders could openly stand against each other:

nam pignora iuncti  
sanguinis et diro ferales omine taedas  
abstulit ad manes Parcarum Iulia saeua  
intercepta manu. quod si tibi fata dedissent  
maiores in luce moras, tu sola furem  
inde uirum poteras atque hinc retinere parentem  
armatasque manus excusso iungere ferro. (I 111–117)

<sup>17</sup> SCHLONSKI (1995: 29 f., n. 24.) gives the outline of these scenes.

In this apostrophe to Julia, which precedes the *synkrisis*, there is not a single word concerning any love felt by Pompey to his father-in-law. Furthermore, Pompey and Caesar are described with the adjective *furens*. Even in this way, Pompey is equated with Caesar, whose essential feature is precisely *furor*, introduced in the *synkrisis* by “in sua templa furit” (I 155)<sup>18</sup>. The phrase “multos per annos dilectus” (V 472) does not necessarily have to mean that Pompey still feels affection to his father-in-law. It becomes a threat directed also at Caesar’s son-in-law. Pompey himself, ending his speech to the army, states: “quod socero bellum praeter ciuile reliqui” (II 595). In this speech it would be very hard to observe any *pietas* towards the rival. None of the leaders is going to quit the war. By mentioning Book I, the narrator also points out that hope of the world is naive and futile, since the alliance of the leaders became exactly the cause of the war (“feralia foedera regni”, I 86).

It is noteworthy that the word *uidit*, which appears both at the beginning of the *ekphrasis* (in the present tense) and at the end of the apostrophe (in the past tense), frames the whole passage (461 ~ 475). It is not without significance that *prima* (461) can be read in two ways, as an adjective – *prima tellus*, “the first earth”, and adverbially, as is sometimes used in poetry – “first time earth...”. Earth (*tellus* understood more generally) sees the leaders in the camps separated by a small space and this introduces a theme which is then developed and continued by *spes mundi* (469). The whole World – not only the soldiers of both leaders (and the narrator’s audience, primary narratees) – sees the generals standing close together; they have the opportunity not only to see their faces but also to hear their voices (compare the scenes of recognition in Books IV and VII). Yet, the fierceness of both leaders causes that the “meeting” occurs when the struggle has already been resolved – Caesar will be able to see the severed head of Pompey. The World thus becomes the internal audience, an element of the spectacle, that looks at the leaders who still play their parts and do not want to look at each other. In a typical scene of recognition such a look results in abandoning his role and rejecting the sword<sup>19</sup>.

#### APOSTROPHE VI 301–313

Caesar and Pompey appear together also in the apostrophe from Book IV (301–313). The first part of this book is devoted to the battle of Dyrrachium, the

---

<sup>18</sup> ROCHE (2009: ad 115 f.): “the zeugma of the epithet *furentem* with *uirum* and *parentem*”. Commenting on *furit* (ad 155) ROCHE also observes: “used of both the living triumvirs at 115; after that, *furere* is applied nowhere else to Pompey, but repeatedly to Caesar”. However, this is true only if we take into account the epithets directly linked with Pompey (see below, on the comparison VI 272 ff.).

<sup>19</sup> For Lucan’s narrative technique as a spectacle, see LEIGH 1997.

only victory of Pompey in his war against Caesar. The apostrophe delimits this long story; the unused victory is commented upon. The narrator focuses on the effects of Pompey's decision, who stopped his soldiers from slaughtering their enemies ("ipse furentis/ dux tenuit gladios", VI 301 f.). This decision is the basis for the commentary where, at the very beginning, the opposition *libertas – regnum* appears:

felix ac libera regum,  
 Roma, fores iurisque tui, uicisset in illo  
 si tibi Sulla loco. dolet, heu, semperque dolebit  
 quod scelerum, Caesar, prodest tibi summa tuorum,  
 cum genero pugnassee pio. pro tristia fata!  
 non Uticae Libye clades, Hispania Mundae  
 flesset et infando pollutus sanguine Nilus  
 nobilius Phario gestasset rege cadauer,  
 nec Iuba Marmaricas nudus pressisset harenas  
 Poenorumque umbras placasset sanguine fuso  
 Scipio, nec sancto caruisset uita Catone.  
 ultimus esse dies potuit tibi Roma malorum,  
 exire e mediis potuit Pharsalia fatis. (VI 301–313)

The apostrophe has two direct addressees. The address to Rome<sup>20</sup> embraces a statement directed to Caesar and an emotive exclamation, later developed into a short story of the civil war and a catalogue of its victims.

This apostrophe is interpreted in two ways: firstly, as Pompeian and anti-Caesarian<sup>21</sup>. In the first part the narrator compares Sulla, Pompey and Caesar. Rome would have been free and fortunate (*felix*), if it were Sulla who gave it a victory. This statement is surprising. Comparing Pompey to Sulla and his cruelty is an invective against Pompey in the mouth of Caesar, found in Book I (330; 326; 335), in his speech to the troops. In Book II Pompey, haranguing his soldiers, names himself *Sulla felicior* when he reminds them, or rather Caesar himself<sup>22</sup>, of his victories (583)<sup>23</sup>, and, on the other hand, he compares Caesar to Marius and Cinna ("ad Cinnas Mariosque uenis", 546). In Book VI, the narrator seems to enter into a dialogue with his characters. For him, Pompey, ceasing the massacre at Dyrrachium, proves that both of them are mistaken. Pompey lacks *saevitia*, cruelty of the leader of the *optimates*, which in that particular moment

<sup>20</sup> Nb. according to SAYLOR (1978: 253 ff.) in Book VI Dyrrachium represents Rome.

<sup>21</sup> E.g. McROBERTS 2005: 41 f.; RAMBAUD 1955: 279 f.

<sup>22</sup> FANTHAM (1992: ad 526–609, p. 179): "...his [*scil.* Pompey's] almost obsessive apostrophe to the absent Caesar shows an inability to relate to his audience...".

<sup>23</sup> After the battle of Pharsalus, the narrator, characterizing Pompey's state of mind, states: "actaque lauriferae damnat Sullana iuuentae", VIII 25.



could have liberated Rome<sup>24</sup>. Pompey is described as *pius* (which makes him resemble Aeneas<sup>25</sup>), so the narrator interprets the holding of swords as a result of *pietas* of a son-in-law towards his father-in-law<sup>26</sup>. Thus, the only one to blame for everything is the father-in-law. The leaders are contrasted with each other: *pietas* against Caesar's *scelera*.

The other way to interpret the apostrophe is less favourable to Pompey. Even the mention of family bonds (*socer* – *gener*) is ambivalent, as we have seen in the apostrophe from Book V. What has been emphasized mainly is the irony of these lines<sup>27</sup>. But once more, as in the case of the apostrophe analyzed before, it is worth looking at a wider context of these lines. The statement that Pompey (and Caesar as well) is not like Sulla<sup>28</sup>, has already appeared. In Book II there is a long story concerning Sulla and Marius, put in the mouth of *parentes*, who perfectly remember that bloody chapter in the history of Rome. It ends with the following observation:

exulibus Mariis bellorum maxima merces  
 Roma recepta fuit, nec plus uictoria Sullae  
 praestitit inuisas penitus quam tollere partes:  
 hos alio, Fortuna, uocas, olimque potentes  
 concurrunt. neuter ciuilia bella moueret  
 contentus quo Sulla fuit. (II 227–232)

Indeed, Sulla was victorious and destroyed his opponents, but then he resigned from power. Pompey, however, is not Sulla – he has other goals that are different from those for which the Senate chose him, that is to fight for *libertas*. These are, of course, the words of the character, with which the narrator does not have to agree, but the addressee of the narration knows them. The speech of the *parentes* is the last in the passage that reflects the voice of the Romans and

<sup>24</sup> For instance AHL (1976: 144 f.); on lines 301–303: “This remark, if meant seriously, suggests that Lucan’s attitude to Sulla has undergone a change since book 2. Lucan seems to be wishing that Pompey really had a touch of Sullan *saevitia* in him” (p. 145).

<sup>25</sup> For the relation between Book VI of the *Civil War* and the *Aeneid* see e.g. TARTARI CHERSONI 1979.

<sup>26</sup> See MARTI 1945: 370; THOMPSON 1984: 212; NARDUCCI 2002: 96 f.; 298 f. NARDUCCI cites this apostrophe as an example to prove that the apology of Pompey, which according to RAMBAUD 1955 takes place in Book VII, starts earlier. LOUNSBURY 1976 also interprets Book VII as an “exoneration and glorification” of Pompey and the Senate.

<sup>27</sup> For the irony of lines 301–303 see CASAMENTO 2005: 178 (whose book is wholly devoted to Marius and Sulla in the *Civil War*) and the scholars cited in note 20 above; the adjective *felix* was a cognomen of Sulla, the first “republican monarch” (LEIGH [1997: 289]: “the first Republican king at Rome”).

<sup>28</sup> For Sulla in Lucan’s poem see esp. CASAMENTO 2005: 24–50; also BARTSCH 1997: 88 f.; MALCOVATI 1953. In the interpretation of the comparison between Pompey and Sulla I follow TESORIERO 2004: 211 f.

their reaction to the war<sup>29</sup>. This series of statements ends in a similar way, as I mentioned before, with the announcement of a tyranny. They are preceded by the narrator's prayer to Jupiter:

cur hanc tibi, rector Olympi,  
sollicitis uisum mortalibus addere curam,  
noscant uenturas ut dira per omina clades?  
.....  
sit subitum quodcumque paras; sit caeca futuri  
mens hominum fati; liceat sperare timenti. (II 4–6; 14 f.)

The prayer, which joins the first and the second book, confirms both the previous predictions (I 584–695) and the following fears of the people. The question directed to Jupiter signals that they are right. Sulla is an ambivalent figure. On the one hand, he is a paradigm of cruelty, and he would have allowed for bloodshed if he were Pompey; on the other hand – he sided with the Senate. In the prophecy of the reanimated corpse (VI 783–792) we find Sulla among the shades of the Republican heroes: Decii, Curii, Camillus, Scipio, Cato and Brutus, the first consul<sup>30</sup>. In fact, in his speech to soldiers Caesar himself cries, addressing Pompey:

quis scelerum modus est? ex hoc iam te, inprobe, regno  
ille tuus saltem doceat descendere Sulla. (I 334 f.)

In the context of the preceding words concerning Sulla, the statement from the apostrophe under discussion (“*felix ac libera regum...*”) does not necessarily mean that Pompey lacks *saevitia*, but that his ambitions are too high. The narrator reminds the reader that the aims of both Pompey and Caesar are the same. Slaughtering the retreating opponents would not have given him such a glory as an open, decisive battle. Pompey's *pietas* is then challenged and in fact it can be

---

<sup>29</sup> For a detailed discussion of this passage (II 67–233), see CONTE 1968; also CASAMENTO 2005 passim.

<sup>30</sup> AHL (1976: 139): “Would Lucan have us believe that all Sulla's vices are pardonable [...], because he was an *optimatus*, a supporter of the senatorial regime? The answer, I suspect, is yes”; see also KORENIAK 1996: ad 787. Usually scholars draw attention to Lucan's intertextual play with a description of the underground in Book VI of the *Aeneid* (for extended bibliography see TESORIERO 2004: 212, n. 89); FEENEY (1986a: 17 f.) notices that Lucan corrects Virgil and ambiguities of the *Aeneid*, placing Drusus and Gracchi beside Catiline (“...placing them where they should ‘really’ have been in Virgil...”; Lucan VI 793–796: “*abruptis Catilina minax fractisque catenis/ exultat Mariique truces nudique Cethegi/ uidi ego laetantis, popularia nomina, Drusus/ legibus inmodicos ausosque ingentia Gracchos*” ~ *Aen.* VI 824 f.; but cf. also lines II 167–172 from the *Georgics*, the catalogue of Italic *gentes* within the *laudes Italiae*; there, Virgil mentions: *Decios, Marios, Camillos, Scipiadas, Caesar*. So Lucan corrects also this passage of his predecessor. For the ambiguity of these lines from the *Georgics* see THOMAS 1982: 45–49; the relationship between the passages of Virgil and Lucan is thoroughly discussed by CASAMENTO 2005: 202–209.

interpreted as irony<sup>31</sup>. Such manner of evoking (through verbal repetitions) a less favourable image of Pompey, which appears in the statements of the characters from the represented world, has been noted by scholars. BARTSCH (1997) stresses its importance, but omits it when discussing these lines. Writing about Sulla, she comes to the following conclusion (89):

Lucan repeated in his poem the anti-Pompeian criticism of his predecessors, but chose to reject them only in his voice as partisan narrator, thus reminding us of their existence and dissociating himself from them as narrator simultaneously. *We are not allowed to forget the Pompey of the early books* [her emphasis].

In her discussion on Sulla, BARTSCH seems to be separating, to a certain extent rightly, two different participants of the literary communication: the implied or real author<sup>32</sup> and the narrator. Unfortunately, BARTSCH does not refer to the specific terminology and narrative theory, and uses the terms ‘Lucan’, ‘poet’, ‘narrator’ with a certain nonchalance, which makes the discussion unclear. In the *Civil War* the anti-Pompeian criticism appears in the statements made by the characters. Naturally, we cannot assign their judgments directly to the narrator. The narrator has no influence on the words of the characters; he does not interfere in what they say, but quotes instead. However, remember that he can omit their words, provide them as *oratio obliqua* and distort or paraphrase them to skip the inconvenient parts. Yet, he does not do that. BARTSCH (1997: 85) poses a question: “Lucan has proved himself perfectly capable of historical distortion [...]. Why invent the Parthian episode [...]?” Nevertheless, we should remember that the narrator tells about it and quotes Pompey’s speech in *oratio recta*. Therefore, it is not Lucan as an implied or real author who undermines the authority of the narrator, but the narrator himself. In this way he suggests that his apostrophes can be read in a completely different manner. In the apostrophe from book VI the narrator indeed appears to be negating the statements made by his characters and the criticism of Pompey as a cruel successor of Sulla. Yet, in case of this exclamation, a clear distinction between the narrator’s view and that

---

<sup>31</sup> TESORIERO (2004: 211): “...a decisive advance upon Rome by Pompey [...] would have saved the lands and people listed at lines 306–313 [...]. *Genero ... pio* is highly ironic indeed!” Similarly ROLLER (1996: 325): “...the adjective *pious* here is also ironic [...]: for thanks to Pompey’s current *pietas*, the mutual communal slaughter will continue...”.

<sup>32</sup> CHATMAN (1978: 148) defines the implied author, which is the “superior” participant in the literary communication, in the following way: “Unlike the narrator, the implied author can *tell* us nothing. He, or better, it has no voice, no direct means of communicating. It instructs us silently, through the design of the whole, with all the voices, by all the means it has chosen to let us learn”. But RIMMON-KENAN (2002: 90) discussing CHATMAN’S definition states that “...the implied author must be seen as a construct inferred and assembled by the reader from all the components of the text”. Furthermore (91), “...the notion of the implied author must be de-personified, and is best considered as a set of implicit norms rather than as a speaker or a voice (i.e. a subject). It follows, therefore, that the implied author cannot literally be a participant in the narrative communication situation”.

of the implied author is too strong, since it is the narrator himself who brings to mind the complaints of the Romans.

The apostrophe summarizes the passage depicting the last stage of the battle of Dyrrachium (after a long *aristeia* of the centurion Scaeva, which is also closed by this rhetorical figure, ll. 227–262). The nearest context of the apostrophe, which often seems to be forgotten by scholars, once more affects its meaning, enhancing the ambiguity of the comparison with Sulla. When the narrator begins to describe Pompey's actions, he uses elaborate aquatic metaphors in his similes. Pompey is compared to a stormy sea and the swollen Po river. Both leaders seem to have been equated by a way of imaging typical for the narrator:

nec magis hac Magnus castrorum parte repulsus  
 intra claustra piger dilato Marte quieuit,  
 quam mare lassatur, cum se tollentibus Euris  
 frangentem fluctus scopulum ferit aut latus alti  
 montis adest seramque sibi parat unda ruinam.  
 hinc uicina petens placido castella profundo  
 incursu gemini Martis rapit, armaque late  
 spargit et effuso laxat tentoria campo,  
 mutandaeque iuuat permissa licentia terrae.  
 sic pleno Padus ore tumens super aggere tutas  
 excurrit ripas et totos concutit agros;  
 succubuit siqua tellus cumuloque furentem  
 undarum non passa ruit, tum flumine toto  
 transit et ignotos operit sibi gurgite campos:  
 illos terra fugit dominos, his rura colonis  
 accedunt donante Pado. (VI 263–278)

This towering but decaying oak from Book I, destined to fall at the first blast of the Eururus (“primo nutet casura sub Euro”, I 141), now during the combat behaves like the father-in-law, like a sea agitated by the winds (the same winds!); he is not waiting indolently, but he acts quickly and effectively (“nec [...] piger” ~ “rapit agmina ductor [Caesar]/ inpiger”, I 228 f.), and wreaks havoc (“sibi parat unda ruinam” ~ “[Caesar] gaudensque uiam fecisse ruina”, I 150). This imagined, stormy sea is contrasted with the nearby calm seashore, to which Pompey makes his way. It is worth recalling that in the first book, before the *synkrisis*, in the passage presenting the triumvirate (i.e. the short period of peace that prevailed, though without the will of the leaders) Crassus is compared to Isthmus (I 100–103) that divides the Ionian and Aegean seas: “nec patitur conferre fretum, si terra recedat,/ Ionium Aegaeo frangat mare” (102 f.). *Hic et nunc*, in the story, Pompey breaks through the fortifications and attacks Caesar's soldiers. However, there is irony in this simile too: the wave strikes against the mountain and “seramque sibi parat [...] ruinam”, “preparing collapse on to itself in time to come” (transl. by BRAUND 1992). Yet, this phrase may be read as a proleptic expression foreshadowing, despite the momentary success, the defeat of Pompey:

the wave prepares his own destruction in the future<sup>33</sup>. When, after breaking the rampart, Pompey occupies a fortified area, he is again compared to the swollen Po, to which the earth yields if it was unable to resist the raging mass of water. *Ruina* (“tellus [...] ruit”) is now caused by the flood, by the *furor* of the river (“siqua tellus cumuloque furentem/ undarum non passa ruit”, 274 f.). *Furor*, as mentioned above, usually characterizes Caesar, but here again by means of the simile it refers to Pompey as in the apostrophe to Julia.

At the end of this passage we slowly pass from the nature to the human world and the effects of the flood of this scale are presented. The land changes its owners because of the river’s rage: “illos terra fugit dominos, his rura colonis/ accedunt donante Pado” (277 f.). The episode of Scaeva finishes with the following exclamation (262): “infelix, quanta dominum uirtute parasti!” In the context of the comparisons that equate Caesar and Pompey it is no coincidence that the word *dominus* is repeated. In this way, the narrator seems to suggest that Pompey’s successes lead to the same thing as the victory of Caesar. This is nothing new: this topic runs throughout Books I and II in the mouth of the characters, as well as of the narrator who wants us to remember about such a leader of the Republican cause. At this point, as the narrator moves on to the reaction of Caesar, who sees the effects of the actions of Pompey – *ruina* appears again. Caesar looks at what he usually leaves behind (“deprendit signa ruinae”, 281). Now he explodes with anger (*furor*), caused by thoughts about the peaceful sleep of the victor (“mouitque furorem/ Pompeiana quies et uicto Caesare somnus”, 282 f.), and attacks Torquatus who retreats behind the walls, compared by the narrator to a sailor lowering the sails before storm:

Torquato ruit inde minax, qui Caesaris arma  
segnius haud uidit, quam malo nauta tremente  
omnia subducit Circaeae uela procellae. (VI 285–287)

Caesar, a thunderbolt of the *synkrisis*, still remains himself (*procella*)<sup>34</sup>. Both leaders are alike. The aquatic similes link the two generals.

The matter becomes more complicated just before the apostrophe. The panic of Caesar’s troops is compared to the plight of people fleeing from flows of lava emerging from Etna. In the simile the narrator refers to the battle of the Giants:

non sic Hennaeis habitans in uallibus horret  
Enceladum spirante Noto, cum tota caernas  
egerit et torrens in campos defluit Aetna,  
Caesaris ut miles... (VI 293–296)

<sup>33</sup> MORFORD (1967: 52): “The simile itself is undistinguished and the second part, the future collapse of the undermined cliff, not very apposite”.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. VIII 203 f. (on Pompey’s troops fleeing from Pharsalus): “sparsus ab Emathia fugit quicumque procella,/ assequitur Magnum”.

The motif of the gigantomachy is scattered throughout the poem. It appears for the first time in the eulogy of Nero: “caelumque suo seruire Tonanti/ non nisi saeuorum potuit post bella gigantum”, I 35 f.)<sup>35</sup>. In the previous books it was Caesar whose actions were depicted as gigantomachic, according to MASTERS (1992: 30), especially in the Massalia episode<sup>36</sup>. But so far, apart from the lines quoted above, the narrator did not juxtapose either Caesar or Pompey with the Giant in such a direct manner. Later in Book VII, before the battle of Pharsalus, Pompey’s soldiers will be associated with the Olympian gods preparing to fight against the Giants (144–150). Now, Pompey, after he has achieved his only victory (unused), is compared with Enceladus. Throughout the poem Caesar figures as a storm, a thunderbolt, Jupiter Tonans (here in this passage he is *procella*) and at the same time as a Giant, the force of Chaos. This ambivalence is present already in the *synkrisis*, where we read that lightning strikes in its own shrine (“in sua templa furit”, I 155)<sup>37</sup>. Enceladus, however, did not try to liberate Olympus from the power of Jupiter and he was not governed by *pietas*. The winners of this war are polluted, now Pompey wins and assumes the role of his father-in-law. This momentary change can be observed in one more passage, immediately after the apostrophe: “arma secuturum soceri, quacumque fugasset” (VI 316). Pompey, who flees Italy and Brundisium, follows his father-in-law, now fleeing from Dyrrachium. So once more, through changing the roles, the narrator challenges Pompey’s *pietas*, which has been mentioned in the apostrophe. This last simile attracts the audience’s attention to the future, the momentary Pompey’s advantage and, what is more important, the results of Pompey’s decision to stop his soldiers. In the world of the comparison Enceladus has already been buried beneath the Mount Etna (the narrator has come full circle and has returned to the first simile: “latus alti/ montis adest seramque sibi parat unda ruinam”, VI 266 f.). The final victory will be achieved by Caesar (storm, *procella* in our simile). After all, it was Jupiter Tonans launching his thunderbolts who defeated the Giant and trapped him underneath this Mount. Just before the apostrophe the narrator states:

totus mitti ciuilibus armis  
usque uel in pacem potuit cruor: ipse furentis dux tenuit gladios. (VI 299–301)

This narrative sentence, spiced up by a commentary, constitutes an introduction, a point of departure for the apostrophe<sup>38</sup>. Pompey stops the swords (*furentis gladios*). First of all, the similes employed and the way in which they depict

<sup>35</sup> See ROCHE 2009: ad I 36.

<sup>36</sup> For the barricade at Brundisium, see BACHOFEN 1972: 82.

<sup>37</sup> For Cesar as Jupiter, see NIX 2008.

<sup>38</sup> The relation of IV 299 with Virg. *Aen.* IX 757–761 (and thus the association of Pompey with Turnus and Aeneas) is discussed by THOMPSON 1984: 211 f.

Pompey provoke the question concerning the kind of peace that would come. In the apostrophe to Scaeva, the narrator exclaims that Scaeva was preparing the ground for the tyrant (*dominum*). The victory of Pompey is just a change of ruler (“*illos terra fugit dominos*”) because Rome lost her freedom at the outbreak of the war. The narrator seems to suggest the words of the astrologer from Book I implicitly to the audience:

scelerique nefando  
nomen erit uirtus, multosque exhibit in annos  
hic furor. et superos quid prodest poscere finem?  
cum domino pax ista uenit. duc, Roma, malorum  
continuum seriem clademque in tempora multa  
extrahe ciuili tantum iam libera bello. (I 667–672)

Rome would be lucky and free from the rulers; yet, this is not Sulla who is fighting, but Pompey and Caesar.

The lines surrounding the discussed apostrophe – that is an attack on Caesar – equate Pompey with him. They seem to oppose the apostrophe, but, at the same time, together they form something that can be called *concordia discors*. Such scholars as McROBERTS draw attention to only one aspect of the text, the external one, overlooking the whole system of references which constitute the complexity of the narrator’s voice. It is the narrator’s voice (this partisan narrator according to BARTSCH) in the four similes discussed above (VI 263–271; 272–278; 285–287; 293–296) that creates the meaning of the whole passage and builds the image of Pompey. The narrator – just like Cato – seems to be on Pompey’s side in this war. However, he presents his actions in two ways: by attacking the winner, he justifies the loser, but at the same time he reminds us that in his attempts Pompey does not differ from Caesar at all, although he should fight for others. On the one hand, Pompey is *pius gener* and a protector of *libertas*, chosen by the senate to fight with Caesar; and on the other hand, it is him, a son-in-law (*gener*), together with the father-in-law (*socer*) who started the war (*nefas*) to seize the power which even Sulla himself had not possessed.

*University of Wrocław*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHL 1976: F.M. AHL, *Lucan: An Introduction*, Ithaca–London 1976 (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 39).  
 ASSO 2008: P. ASSO, *The Intrusive Trope – Apostrophe in Lucan*, MD LXI 2008, pp. 161–173.  
 BACHOFEN 1972: A. BACHOFEN, *Cäsars und Lucans Bellum Civile: Ein Inhaltsvergleich*, Diss. Zürich 1972.  
 BANNON 1997: C.J. BANNON, *The Brothers of Romulus: Fraternal Pietas in Roman Law, Literature, and Society*, Princeton, NJ 1997.

- BARTSCH 1997: S. BARTSCH, *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*, Cambridge, MA–London 1997.
- BRAUND 1992: Lucan, *Civil War*, transl. with an introduction and notes by S.H. BRAUND, Oxford 1992.
- CASAMENTO 2005: A. CASAMENTO, *La parola e la guerra. Rappresentazioni letterarie del Bellum civile in Lucano*, Bologna 2005.
- CHATMAN 1978: S. CHATMAN, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Ithaca–London 1978.
- CONTE 1968: G.B. CONTE, *La guerra civile nella rievocazione del popolo. Lucano II 67-233: Stile e forma della Pharsalia*, Maia XX 1968, pp. 224–253.
- D'ALESSANDRO BEHR 2007: F. D'ALESSANDRO BEHR, *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion*, Columbus, OH 2007.
- DE JONG 2009: I. DE JONG, *Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature*, in: J. GRETHLEIN, A. RENGAKOS (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin–New York 2009, pp. 87–115.
- FABER 2005: R.A. FABER, *The Adaptation of Apostrophe in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, in: C. DEROUX (ed.), *Studies in Roman History and Latin Literature XII*, Bruxelles 2005 (Collection Latomus 287), pp. 334–343.
- FANTHAM 1992: Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, *De bello civili. Book II*, ed. by E. FANTHAM, Cambridge 1992.
- FEENEY 1986a: D.C. FEENEY, *History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld*, PCPhS XXXII 1986, pp. 1–24.
- 1986b: “*Stat magni nominis umbra*”. *Lucan on the Greatness of Pompeius Magnus*, CQ XXXVI 1986, pp. 239–243.
- GENETTE 1988: G. GENETTE, *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, transl. by J.E. LEWIN, Ithaca–New York 1988.
- KACANDES 1994: I. KACANDES, *Narrative Apostrophe: Reading, Rhetoric, Resistance in Michel Butor's La modification and Julio Cortázar's Graffiti*, Style XXVIII 1994, pp. 329–349.
- KORENJAK 1996: M. KORENJAK, *Die Ericthoszene in Lukans Pharsalia: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Bern–Frankfurt a.M. 1996 (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 101).
- KORTE 1987: B. KORTE, *Das Du im Erzähltext. Kommunikationsorientierte Betrachtungen zu einer vielgebrauchten Form*, Poetica XIX 1987, pp. 169–189.
- LEIGH 1997: M. LEIGH, *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement*, Oxford–New York 1997.
- LOUNSBURY 1976: R.C. LOUNSBURY, *History and Motive in Book Seven of Lucan's Pharsalia*, Hermes CIV 1976, pp. 210–239.
- MALCOVATI 1953: E. MALCOVATI, *Lucano e Cicerone*, Athenaeum XXXI 31 1953, pp. 288–297.
- MARTI 1945: B.M. MARTI, *The Meaning of Pharsalia*, AJPh LXVI 1945, pp. 352–376.
- MASTERS 1992: J. MASTERS, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, Cambridge 1992.
- MCRBERTS 2005: S.S. MCRBERTS, *Lucan's War on Caesar*, Diss. University of Wisconsin–Madison 2005.
- MORFORD 1967: M.P.O. MORFORD, *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic*, Oxford 1967.
- NARDUCCI 2002: E. NARDUCCI, *Lucano. Un'epica contro l'impero. Interpretazione della "Pharsalia"*, Roma–Bari 2002 (Percorsi 34).
- NEWMYER 1983: S. NEWMYER, *Imagery as a Means of Character Portrayal in Lucan*, in: C. DEROUX (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. III, Bruxelles 1983, pp. 226–252 (Collection Latomus 153).
- NIX 2008: S.A. NIX, *Caesar as Jupiter in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, CJ CIII 2008, pp. 281–194.
- RAMBAUD 1955: M. RAMBAUD, *L'apologie de Pompée par Lucain au Livre VII de la Pharsale*, REL XXXIII 1955, pp. 258–296.
- RIMMON-KENAN 2002: S. RIMMON-KENAN, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, London–New York 2002.
- ROCHE 2009: Lucan, *De Bello Ciuili I: A Commentary*, ed., with introduction and commentary by P. ROCHE, Oxford 2009.



- ROLLER 1996: M.B. ROLLER, *Ethical Contradiction and the Fractured Community in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, *ClAnt* XV 1996, pp. 319–347.
- ROSNER-SIEGEL 1983: J.A. ROSNER-SIEGEL, *The Oak and the Lightning. Lucan, Bellum Civile 1.135–157*, *Athenaeum* LXI 1983, pp. 165–177.
- ROSSI 2000: A. ROSSI, *The Aeneid Revisited: The Journey of Pompey in Lucan's Pharsalia*, *AJPh* CXXI 2000, pp. 571–591.
- SAYLOR 1978; Ch.F. SAYLOR, *Belli Spes Inproba: The Theme of Walls in Lucan, Pharsalia VI*, *TAPhA* CVIII 1978, pp. 243–257.
- SCHLONSKI 1995: F. SCHLONSKI, *Studien zum Erzählerstandort bei Lucan*, Bochum 1995.
- SCHÖNBERGER 1960: O. SCHÖNBERGER, *Leitmotivisch wiederholte Bilder bei Lucan*, *RhM* CIII 1960, pp. 81–90.
- 1961: *Untersuchungen zur Wiederholungstechnik Lucans*, Heidelberg 1961.
- TARTARI CHERSONI 1979: M. TARTARI CHERSONI, *Lucano e la tradizione epica virgiliana: ripresa e contrapposizione nel libro VI del Bellum civile*, *BollStudLat* IX 1979, pp. 25–39.
- TESORIERO 2004: C. TESORIERO, *The Middle of Lucan*, in: *Middles in Latin Poetry*, ed. by S. KYRIAKIDIS and F. DE MARTINO, Bari 2004, pp. 183–216 (Le Rane. Collana di Studi e Testi. Testi 38).
- THOMAS 1982: R.F. THOMAS, *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition*, Cambridge 1982 (PCPhS, Supplementary Volume 7).
- THOMPSON 1984: L. THOMPSON, *A Lucanian Contradiction of Virgilian "pietas": Pompey's "amor"*, *CJ* LXXIX 1984, pp. 207–215.
- VIANINO 1974: G. VIANINO, *Studi sul Bellum civile di Lucano*, Salerno 1974.
- WILLIAMS 1983: G. WILLIAMS, *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*, New Haven–London 1983.

