The Classical Quarterly (2021) 71.2 721–740
doi:10.1017/S0009838821000951

LUCAN'S CICERO: DISMEMBERING A LEGEND*

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a new synthetic account of the presence of Cicero as both character and source in Lucan's Bellum Ciuile*. Lucan's treatment is derived primarily from Virgil's technique for creating intertextually complex characters, but further builds on Sallust's displacement of Cicero in his narrative of the Catilinarian conspiracy and on the declamatory practice of reducing the orator to a few prominent and recognizable traits. Cicero the character, as he briefly appears at the opening of the seventh book, is not simply an ahistorical caricature: he is constructed through a careful series of allusions designed to indict his use of violence in the suppression of Catiline. Other prominent aspects of Cicero in the tradition are displaced and transferred to other characters more important to Lucan's design, Cato and Pompey. Lucan's depiction of Pompey, especially his death and decapitation, draws on the language and affect of the tradition associated with Cicero, using Cicero's own words and the obituary of Cicero in the lost historical epic of Cornelius Severus. Finally, the language of Cicero's peace-making efforts in his correspondence, suppressed in Lucan's depiction of him as a warmonger, forms an important part of the narrator's own emotional evocations of the impending catastrophe of civil war. The combination of models Lucan uses is more broadly reflective of his technique in composing a historical epic.*

Keywords: Lucan; Cicero; Pompey; Cato; intertextuality; historical epic; character

Cicero the character makes a brief but decisive appearance in Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*: following murmurings of dissatisfaction from the soldiers early in the seventh book of the poem, he steps forward to channel their sentiments in a short speech (7.68–85). The speech is the final push that brings the hesitant Pompey to join battle at Pharsalus, the battle that he will lose. This Cicero, as scholars have noted, is not just out of place (he was not at the camp at Pharsalus, having stayed behind in Dyrrachium): he does not sound much like Cicero and his speech accomplishes the exact opposite of the historical Cicero's persistent attempts at peacemaking in the lead-up to the conflict.[1] Lucan's Cicero has been described as a caricature in line with attacks on Cicero familiar from the declamatory tradition.[2] Yet unlike those attacks,

* A version of this paper was first presented at the conference *Ritratti di Cicerone–Portraying Cicero*, held in Rome in May 2019, and later versions to a workshop for graduate students at the University of Athens and to audiences at Cambridge University and the University of Oslo. I am grateful for all the feedback I received. My thanks also to my colleagues Denis Feeney and Robert Kaster and to this journal's anonymous reader and the editor for their comments and suggestions.

[1] Cic. *Fam.* 9.18.2 *in acie non fui*. See P. Esposito, 'Cicerone a Farsàlo', *Ciceroniana on line* 2 (2018), 39–54, at 40–3 for a recent synthesis of the evidence. On Lucan's distortion, N. Lanzarone, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis liber VII* (Florence, 2016), 148 on 7.62–7: 'La scelta di Lucano viola gravemente la vericidità storica'; cf. a sequential overview in Esposito (this note), 45–8, to which can be added M. Rambaud, 'L'apologie de Pompée par Lucain au livre VII de la Pharsale', *RÉL* 33 (1955), 258–96, at 263–4; D. Gagliardi, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis liber VII* (Florence, 1975), 20 on 7.63, and his summary, 49–50; and R. Lounsbury, 'History and motive in Book Seven of Lucan's *Pharsalia*', *Hermes* 14 (1976), 210–39, at 213.

[2] Caricature: E. Malcovati, 'Lucano e Cicerone', *Athenaeum* 41 (1953), 288–97, at 291;

© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which target well known and well-documented weaknesses in their object's record, this portrait is peculiar in almost drawing attention to the fictionality of its stage-setting. While the episode itself, as well as the presence of Ciceronian material in other parts of the poem, has received attention from scholars, there has not been a satisfactory analysis of the reasons for Lucan's invention.[3] In this article I return to the question of Lucan's peculiar treatment of Cicero and propose a new framework for its interpretation. This framework both offers a new understanding of the short episode in which Cicero the character appears, and embraces multiple Ciceronian presences within the poem that are, in their variety, reflective of Lucan's multifaceted technique in composing a historical epic.

The interpretative framework I propose takes Virgil's handling of multiple sources in constructing intertextually complex characters in the *Aeneid* as the dominant model for Lucan's handling of Cicero in the poem. Given that the subject of Lucan's poem is historical events, another major model, within the larger Virgilian framework, is historiographical: Sallust's treatment of the character of Cicero the consul in the *Bellum Catilinae*. Finally, the declamatory practice of representing Cicero as the epitome of Roman eloquence and of Republican freedom does play an important role in Lucan's portrayal of Cicero. I begin my discussion by briefly outlining the techniques which Lucan draws on from each of these models. I then proceed to read Cicero in the *Bellum Ciuile* in two parts. First, I focus on Cicero the character, and especially the brief introduction with which the poet prefaces his speech in Book 7. Second, I examine other Ciceronian presences in the poem, in the characters of Pompey and Cato and in the words of the narrator.

MODELS OF TECHNIQUE

The three genres that most influence Lucan's treatment of character, and of the character of Cicero especially, are epic, historiography and declamation. It is consistent with the poem's primary generic identity as an epic poem that Virgil's intertextual technique for

E. Narducci, 'Cicerone nella "Pharsalia" di Lucano', in id. (ed.), *Aspetti della fortuna di Cicerone nella cultura latina* (Florence, 2003), 78–91, at 82–4; M. Fucecchi, 'Partisans in civil war', in P. Asso (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Lucan* (Leiden, 2011), 237–56, at 247; G. La Bua, *Cicero and Roman Education: The Reception of the Speeches and Ancient Scholarship* (Cambridge, 2019), 106. Esposito (n. 1), 49–50 connects Lucan's disapproval to the split between 'ammirazione letteraria e riserve etico-politiche' seen in Sen. *Breu.* 5.1–3. A. Gowing, 'Tully's boat: responses to Cicero in the Imperial period', in C. Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero* (Cambridge, 2013), 233–50, at 244 sees the portrait as on balance a positive one.

[3] Rambaud (n. 1), 263–6, followed by Lanzarone (n. 1), 148 on 7.62–7, sees the episode as part of a more general effort to absolve Pompey of responsibility for the defeat; similarly, Gagliardi (n. 1), 20; Lounsbury (n. 1), 213–14; E. Narducci, *Lucano: un'epica contro l'impero* (Rome, 2002), 299–302; id. (n. 2), 83. This interpretation does not account for the choice of Cicero in particular nor for the negative portrayal of the orator. P. Roche, *Lucan De Bello Ciuili Book VII* (Cambridge, 2019), 84 places the emphasis on Pompey in a more nuanced way: 'Lines 62–85 widen the scope of responsibility for Pharsalus without exonerating Pompey'; he follows the scholarly tradition in which Cicero here stands for the authority of the Senate. I. Meunier, *Le* De bello ciuili *de Lucain, une parole en mutation: de la rhétorique républicaine à une poétique de la guerre civile* (Diss., Paris, 2012), 181–204 moves beyond the focus on Pompey and stresses the importance of critique of unscrupulous oratory, but in treating Cicero simply as a stand-in for eloquence de-emphasizes other aspects of the passage. Most recently, A. Baertschi, 'Cicero, Lucan, and rhetorical role-play in *Bellum Civile* 7', in L. Zientek and M. Thorne (edd.), *Lucan's Imperial World: The* Bellum Civile *in its Contemporary Contexts* (London, 2020), 51–70 offers a reading of Cicero's speech as a self-consciously fictional *suasoria*, 'deliberate rhetorical role-play' (at 52).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

constructing his characters in the *Aeneid* serves as the primary model.[4] Virgil's method is twofold: from the point of view of individual characters within the *Aeneid*, looking back at Virgil's sources, Virgil combines features of characters derived from his intertexts; from the perspective of his models, as is especially clear in the case of Homer, characters are split, their various facets attaching to multiple characters in Virgil's poem. This splitting technique has the additional effect of creating intratextual links among characters within the *Aeneid*. For example, the integrative, or 'many in one,' side of this process can be seen in the multiple intertexts that make up the character of Dido:[5] a list of intertexts that contribute would include Homer's Arete, Nausicaa, Circe, Calypso, Helen, Penelope, Hector; Apollonius' Medea; tragedy's Ajax, Antigone, Alcestis, Deianira, Medea; Catullus' Ariadne; and historical figures, most prominently Cleopatra.[6] On the splitting, or 'one in many,' side, we can see features of one Homeric character, for instance Nausicaa, split among multiple Virgilian ones: the virginal princess who might marry the protagonist and serve as a way of rooting him in a new land is clearly linked to Lavinia, but the simile that compares her to Artemis in the *Odyssey* (6.102–5) is transferred to Dido in the *Aeneid* (1.498–502). The connection to Nausicaa serves in part to draw attention to Dido's paradoxical status as an available widow, but also to foreshadow the failure of her union with Aeneas, whose simile links him to Apollo, Diana's brother.[7] Within the poem, these links create a dynamic whereby Aeneas travels from the wrong Nausicaa (Dido) to one that will turn out to be right (Lavinia), yet is infected by the instability and the contestation that surrounds her unlucky predecessor. It is important to note that this splitting technique is not limited to literary intertexts, but applies to Virgil's treatment of historical characters as well: so Cleopatra appears as herself in the representation of the Battle of Actium on the Shield of Aeneas (*Aen.* 8.688, 8.696–7, 8.707–8), but she is also part of the makeup of the character of Dido, the queen whose influence is deflecting the proto-Roman from his mission and his identity, and of Camilla, the warrior-woman who joins battle against Aeneas.[8]

[4] This general technique is a model for all later Latin epic poets, not only Lucan. For the Flavian epicists' deployment of 'combinatorial imitation' in relation to Virgil's own text, see P. Hardie, 'Flavian epicists on Virgil's epic technique', *Ramus* 18 (1989), 3–20, with examples from Ovid and Lucan at 4–5.

[5] An extreme case, perhaps, but a useful illustration; cf. N. Horsfall, *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden, 1995), 133: 'In despair, attentive readers of *Aen.* 4 are reduced to drawing up lengthy lists of Dido's mythical and literary analogues.'

[6] On the Homeric characters, see G. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer. Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis* (Göttingen, 1964); the fold-out charts at the end of the book serve as an excellent visual representation of the splitting technique; on Apollonius, D. Nelis, *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Cambridge, 2001); on tragedy, e.g. V. Panoussi, *Vergil's "Aeneid" and Greek Tragedy: Ritual, Empire, and Intertext* (Cambridge, 2009); cf. Y. Baraz, 'Euripides' Corinthian princess in the *Aeneid*', *CPh* 104 (2009), 317–30; on Catullus, P. Oksala, 'Das Aufblühen des römischen Epos: Berührungen zwischen der Ariadne-Episode Catulls und der Dido-Geschichte Vergils', *Arctos* 3 (1962), 167–97; on Cleopatra, A.S. Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis liber quartus* (Cambridge, MA, 1935), 24–8; cf. A. Keith, *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic* (Cambridge, 2000), 118–19.

[7] Mediated through the analogous similes in Apollonius: Nelis (n. 6), 82–6, 133. For an analysis of Virgil's recasting of the Nausicaa–Artemis simile, considered inappropriate by Probus, see, for example, D. West, 'Multiple-correspondence similes in the *Aeneid*', *JRS* 59 (1969), 40–9, at 43–4; M.K. Thornton, 'The adaptation of Homer's Artemis–Nausicaa simile in the *Aeneid*', *Latomus* 44 (1985), 615–22. V. Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (Wiesbaden, 1950), 113 briefly considers the tragic implications of the two related similes.

[8] On Camilla as Cleopatra, V. Viparelli, 'Camilla: a queen undefeated, even in death', *Vergilius* 54 (2008), 9–23, at 15–23.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sallust's treatment of Cicero in his first-person historical account of Catiline's conspiracy is broadly similar to the splitting technique I have described for Virgil's epic, but shows—as we would expect—important differences. Sallust is writing not only in response to historical events, in which Cicero was an actor, but after those events have been textualized, above all by Cicero himself. Sallust's text, therefore, is interacting both with the events and with their representation by one of the main actors in those events, resulting in a unique treatment for Cicero the character in Sallust's text. In Cicero's corpus, his suppression of the conspiracy is his signature accomplishment, and he is the protagonist in the events he represents. Sallust's Cicero is a minor character, for several reasons.[9] One is structural: Sallust's interest in Cato and Caesar as contrasting characters and in the presentation of their conflicting ideas in the speeches the historian gives them, in line with the historian's generally antithetical style and thought patterns, leaves no room for Cicero's speeches (thus the fourth Catilinarian is written out of history) and little room for his actions.[10] The relationship between the importance of Cato and Caesar as proportional to the un-importance of Cicero is clear from Sallust's practice in using his name: in the lead-up to the speeches and the syncrisis that follows them, Sallust regularly names him, mostly as Cicero, occasionally as Marcus Tullius, and sometimes refers to him as 'the consul'. The naming stops as soon as we enter the Senate meeting at which the speeches of Cato and Caesar are exchanged, and even references to Cicero as 'the consul' virtually disappear: he is mentioned a couple of times in the speeches themselves, and only once in the subsequent narrative.

Just as the voices of Cato and Caesar silence Cicero, so the historian himself takes over the role that Cicero played in the events. The discovery of the conspiracy, the identification of the conspirators, the revelation of their depravity and their goals, and the analysis of their motivations: all these actions are performed by Cicero and represented by him, at the time, in the Catilinarian orations and, later, in his self-presentation in many of the works that followed. In Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* these acts are mentioned briefly by the narrator, as performed by the *optumus consul*,[11] to the extent which the narrative requires, but are much more extensively and effectively performed by the narrator himself for the benefit of the reader. Sallust the historian reveals the origins of depravity in Catiline's character, presents the kinds of people who joined him, and discloses the antecedents of the conspiracy. Cicero has been not so much written out as he has been overwritten by Sallust. His actions and words are still present but, in the eyes of the reader, the historian is the one to be credited with the very achievements on which Cicero based his reputation. Sallust has displaced and replaced the consul, thereby making him a minor character in what Cicero considered the most important drama of his career. Sallust's technique in treating Cicero, then, shows two separate but related processes. First, partial suppression and erasure motivated by the overriding importance of other characters to how the historian structures and presents the events. Second, splitting, analogous to what we saw in Virgil, with the crucial difference that the narrator is the one to whom some of the content that

[9] One reason often given in the scholarship is bias (for overview, see P. McGushin, *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary* [Leiden, 1977], 154–5 on *Cat.* 22.3), but see the effective rebuttal and discussion of reasons for omitting the Catilinarians in R. Syme, *Sallust* (Berkeley, 1964), 105–6, 110–11. See also Gowing (n. 2), 234–5; La Bua (n. 2), 102–3.

[10] Cf. Syme (n. 9), 111: 'he [Cicero] has to yield prominence at once to Caesar and to Cato.'

[11] *Cat.* 43.1, with McGushin (n. 9), 218 ad loc.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

had belonged to the character, who was himself an author, is redirected. As we shall see, Lucan configures his narrator similarly in relation to Cicero the author of texts about civil war.

Finally, declamatory practice in relation to Cicero has been extensively treated in recent work, and can be briefly described here as a process of reduction and simplification, producing two contrasting portraits: one positive, one negative.[12] On the positive side, Cicero is reduced to a stand-in for Republican eloquence and his career is largely reduced to the moment of his melodramatic death, which in turn is reduced to a symbol for the death of liberty. The negative approach presents a weak, ineffectual, self-aggrandizing man pitted against the eulogistic paradigm. Whether the inflection given is positive or negative, the reduction produces several distinct and recognizable incarnations of Cicero: Cicero the embodiment of eloquence, Cicero the consul who exposed the Catilinarian conspiracy, Cicero the failed peacemaker at the start of the Civil War, Cicero the dismembered victim, and Cicero whose death is the symbol of the death of liberty.[13]

With these mechanisms at work in Lucan's generic models in mind, I now turn to Ciceronian presences in his poem. Following the twofold analysis of the dominant Virgilian technique, I begin my investigation with the 'many in one' intertextuality and look at the introduction of Cicero the character in Book 7 of the *Bellum Ciuile*. Following that discussion, I turn to the 'one in many' side of the process and explore the diffusion of Cicero in the rest of the poem.

MANY IN ONE: CICERO AT PHARSALUS

Book 7 of Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile* brings the reader to the decisive battle of the war, Pharsalus. As the day of the battle dawns, the poet recounts the soldiers' desire to fight and their dissatisfaction with Pompey's hesitation (7.45–61). Cicero is introduced immediately following this sketch of the popular mood. The function of his character in the narrative is as an effective mouthpiece for the soldiers' sentiment, and his speech (7.68–85) is what forces Pompey into action. My focus in this section will be on Lucan's introduction of the orator (7.62–7):

> cunctorum uoces Romani maximus auctor
> Tullius eloquii, cuius sub iure togaque
> pacificas saeuos tremuit Catilina securis,
> pertulit iratus bellis, cum rostra forumque

[12] See T. Keeline, *The Reception of Cicero in the Early Roman Empire: The Rhetorical Schoolroom and the Creation of a Cultural Legend* (Cambridge, 2018); R.A. Kaster, 'Becoming "CICERO"', in P. Knox and C. Foss (edd.), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen* (Stuttgart, 1998), 248–63; M. Roller, 'Color-blindness: Cicero's death, declamation, and the production of history', *CPh* 92 (1997), 109–30; R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, 'Cicerone nella prima età imperiale', in E. Narducci (ed.), *Aspetti della fortuna di Cicerone nella cultura Latina* (Florence, 2003), 3–54. Cf. La Bua (n. 2), 100–12; Gowing (n. 2), 236–7; L. Canfora, 'Immagine tardoantica di Cicerone', in E. Narducci (ed.), *Cicerone nella tradizione europea: dalla tarda antichità al Settecento* (Florence, 2006), 3–16, at 3–6.

[13] Accounts of the Early Imperial historians generally follow the declamatory patterns. See Keeline (n. 12), 118–30 on Velleius Paterculus, Valerius Maximus and Pliny the Elder, and Degl'Innocenti Pierini (n. 12), 31–7 on Velleius and Valerius; cf. Gowing (n. 2), 237–8 on Velleius.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

optaret passus tam longa silentia miles.
addidit inualidae robur facundia causae.

The greatest author of Roman
eloquence, Tullius, under whose civic command
savage Catiline trembled at the peacemaking axes,
angry at the wars, relayed the voices of all, since he desired
the rostra and the forum, having suffered such long silence as a soldier.
His eloquence added strength to the weak cause.

As I noted above, Cicero here is displaced: he was not at Pharsalus. But he is not simply out of place: this is also a 'reduced' Cicero, having undergone the same process of distillation and simplification that is typical of declamation, apparent here especially in the framing of the introduction by references to his eloquence as the defining trait.[14] Cicero's eloquence is at the core of the positive portrait of the reduced-declamatory Cicero, but here it receives negative colouring. In the last line Lucan explicitly evokes the tradition of viewing eloquence, and rhetoric more generally, as a dangerous weapon when wielded irresponsibly, the force for making the weak argument (*inualida causa*) appear strong.[15] His Cicero enjoys eloquence for its own sake and misses having opportunities to speak,[16] so when he does speak his eloquence is eloquence misused. But here displacement is again at work: the weak cause the orator advocates is one that he not only did not plead but also consistently and publicly resisted; the correspondence, both before and after the advent of the Civil War, shows that Cicero advocated for peace.[17] At first glance, then, Lucan's Cicero is indeed a simplified caricature: out of place in a military setting, unable to endure the lack of opportunities to show off his oratory, giving voice to the desire of the *turba*, of the *cuncti*; being led by the crowd, instead of trying to lead it.

Yet even this apparently straightforward reference to Cicero's eloquence is not as simple as it first appears to be. The opening line labels him as *Romani maximus auctor Tullius eloquii*, and the closing line returns to his rhetorical skill but with a different term, *facundia*.[18] This framing points to different intertexts with which Lucan is working as he constructs his Cicero. First, *eloquium*. This noun, a partial synonym for the unmetrical *eloquentia*, is first used by Virgil, coined by analogy with *colloquium* and *adloquium*. It appears once in the *Aeneid*, used by Turnus in his angry response to a provocation by the resident Latin orator, Drances.[19] Turnus stresses Drances' identity as

[14] Cicero's eloquence is at the centre of his declamatory reception; see the studies listed in note 12 above.

[15] References in Lanzarone (n. 1), 153 ad loc. Meunier (n. 3), 181–204 reads the episode as primarily a critique of oratory, for which Cicero is a vehicle.

[16] *passus tam longa silentia* alludes to Cicero's own references to extended silence as constraint, most famously in the first sentence of the *Pro Marcello* (1): *diuturni silenti, patres conscripti, quo eram his temporibus usus—non timore aliquo, sed partim dolore, partim uerecundia—finem hodiernus dies attulit, idemque initium quae uellem quaeque sentirem meo pristino more dicendi*. See Narducci (n. 2), 82.

[17] *Att.* 7.14.3 sums up his view of the matter: *equidem ad pacem hortari non desino, quae uel iniusta utilior est quam iustissimum bellum cum ciuibus.* For the correspondence, see n. 58 below.

[18] On the importance of this framing, cf. Meunier (n. 3), 189–91, with different emphases.

[19] N. Horsfall, *Virgil,* Aeneid *11. A Commentary* (Leiden, 2003), 242 ad loc., the only commentator to note this appearance of the word, describes it as a 'metrically convenient substitute for *facundia*'. It should be noted, however, that *facundia* does not occur in Republican poetry other than once in Terence (discussed below), and Virgil himself never uses it (nor does Cicero). Aside from Terence,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a speaker rather than as a warrior, and challenges his right to give advice in war (*Aen.* 11.383–6):

> proinde tona eloquio (solitum tibi) meque timoris
> argue tu, Drance, quando tot stragis aceruos
> Teucrorum tua dextra dedit, passimque tropaeis
> insignis agros.
>
> Then thunder with your eloquence (that's what you always do) and accuse me
> of cowardice, Drances, when as many heaps of slaughtered
> Trojans your right hand has given, and everywhere with trophies
> marked out the fields.

The emphasis on the orator's lack of military experience and the self-interest of his speech is not limited to his target, Turnus, but is shared by the narrator, and is apparent especially in the poet's introduction to Drances' speech (*Aen.* 11.336–42):

> tum Drances idem infensus, quem gloria Turni
> obliqua inuidia stimulisque agitabat amaris,
> largus opum et lingua melior, sed frigida bello
> dextera, consiliis habitus non futtilis auctor,
> seditione potens (genus huic materna superbum
> nobilitas dabat, incertum de patre ferebat),
> surgit et his onerat dictis atque aggerat iras.
>
> Then Drances, similarly hostile, whom Turnus' glory
> was pressing with bitter goads of hidden envy,
> a man expansive in wealth and good at speech, though in war
> his right hand was cold, considered not useless as a giver of advice,
> powerful in confrontation (pride in ancestry his mother's
> noble lineage gave him; from his father's side his line was uncertain),
> rises and piles high and heavy their anger with the following words.

The similarity of the unwarlike orator to Cicero was first noticed in the Renaissance.[20] In the scholarship on the *Aeneid* there is disagreement on this point, and scholars who argue against the connection point to the importance of wealth and of the status difference between Drances' parents to the way in which the character is presented. Yet it would be surprising to find that Virgil based the character on Cicero alone, given his general practice of combining references. Regardless of what we think of Drances in the *Aeneid*, however, Lucan's deployment of Virgil's description of him as a model in introducing his Cicero indicates that Lucan read Drances as a Cicero-like character. That is, he redirected the partial allusion to a historical figure within the makeup of a Virgilian character to that historical figure's appearance in his own poem. This pattern is not unique to Virgil's Drances and Lucan's Cicero: the same basic mechanism can be seen in Lucan's account of Pompey's death, in which he incorporates Virgil's allusion to Pompey's death in the concluding lines of the description of the death of Priam in the *Aeneid*.[21] In Lucan's introduction of Cicero, the use of *eloquium* is a strongly marked

the earliest attested poetic usage is in Horace (four times). Furthermore, neither Cicero nor Virgil uses the adjective *facundus*.

[20] For the unmilitary Cicero, Livy, *Per.* 111 says it all: *uir nihil minus quam ad bella natus*.

[21] Luc. 1.685–6 *hunc ego, fluminea deformis truncus harena | qui iacet, agnosco* and 8.698–9 *truncusque uadosis | huc illuc iactatur aquis*, alluding to Verg. *Aen*. 2.557–8 *iacet ingens litore truncus, | auulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus*. See E. Narducci, 'Il tronco di Pompeo

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

allusion, similar to *truncus* in the case of Pompey. But beyond verbal correspondences, the two appearances are similarly structured: as we saw, in Virgil Drances is first identified by the combination of his eloquence and his lack of military ability; he then gives problematic advice with disastrous consequences, and after the speech, like Cicero in Lucan, he disappears from the poem. The Virgilian intertext, then, points to the unscrupulous and self-interested character of Ciceronian eloquence and its destructive potential for those who receive his advice.

In his commentary on Drances' appearance and speech, Nicholas Horsfall draws attention to the scene's tone as recalling Late Republican political conflicts and, especially, its Sallustian quality.[22] There is a Sallustian residue, then, in Lucan's allusion to Cicero as Virgil's Drances, but Sallust's presence in the passage is made stronger by Lucan's use of *facundia*.[23] Like *eloquium*, this noun does not appear in Cicero's own corpus. In fact, its only attestation before Sallust is in the prologue to Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos* (13) where it refers to the actor's ability to deliver with facility the playwright's defence of his plot.[24] It is likely, then, that when Sallust uses the word (six times in the surviving corpus) it appears archaic.[25] In Sallust's usage, the quality of speaking that *facundia* designates is attributed three times to Greeks, once to Memmius and once to Sulla.[26] One last instance, in a fragment of the *Histories*, has been taken by some scholars to refer to Cicero: if that were the case, that would add further weight to Lucan's intertextual building of Cicero the character, but I do not believe that there is evidence to support such a claim.[27] Regardless, the word has a Sallustian tinge to it, and a further Ciceronian association, this time a certain one, deriving from a fragment from a poem by Cornelius Severus.

The fragment, the most substantial to survive from this contemporary of Ovid's, is a eulogy of Cicero preserved in a declamatory context, in the concluding section of Seneca the Elder's sixth *suasoria* devoted to the subject of Cicero's death (6.26).[28] I

(Troia e Roma nella *Pharsalia*)', *Maia* 25 (1973), 317–25, at 321–4; cf. J. Mebane, 'Pompey's head and the body politic in Lucan's *De bello ciuili*', *TAPhA* 146 (2016), 191–215, at 209–10; A. McClellan, *Abused Bodies in Roman Epic* (Cambridge, 2019), 72–3.

[22] Horsfall (n. 19), 215: 'a contemporary, political, even specifically Sallustian flavor to V's remarkable invention'; cf. 216 on 338 and Drances' wealth: 'Dr., after all, is a late-republican politician', citing Sall. *Cat.* 3.4.

[23] Meunier (n. 3), 189–90 emphasizes the Ovidian usage, referring to prose as opposed to poetic eloquence.

[24] The passage makes clear that the skill belongs to an orator as opposed to an actor, and the context which it invokes is forensic (Ter. *Haut.* 11–15): *oratorem esse uoluit me, non prologum:* | *uostrum iudicium fecit; me actorem dedit.* | *sed hic actor tantum poterit a facundia* | *quantum ille potuit cogitare commode* | *qui orationem hanc scripsit quam dicturu' sum?*

[25] K. Vretska, *C. Sallustius Crispus: De Catilinae Coniuratione*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg, 1976), 2.631 on Sall. *Cat.* 53.3. Vretska also suggests that the word has poetic colouring, but it is difficult to assert that with any confidence, given the lack of any other attestations between Terence and Sallust.

[26] Greek: *Cat.* 53.3, *Iug.* 63.3, *Hist.* 2.47.4; Memmius: *Iug.* 30.4; Sulla: *Iug.* 102.4.

[27] *canina eloquentia, ut ait Appius, exercebatur.* See the summary of various assignments of the fragment in J.T. Ramsey, *Fragments of the Histories. Letters to Caesar* (Cambridge, MA, 2015), 419 (inc. 33). The connection to Cicero comes from a quotation in Lactant. *Diu. inst.* 6.18.26, which led Maurenbrecher to assign it to *Hist.* 4.54. Lactantius uses the quotation in the course of criticizing Cicero, but there is nothing to indicate definitively that his source referred to Cicero; moreover, Quintilian's use of the same phrase, attributed directly to Appius, in reference to behaviour of which he highly disapproves (pure abuse), makes it unlikely that the phrase was known to have been used against Cicero.

[28] Editions with commentary: E. Courtney, *Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993), 325–7 (fr. 13); A. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry* c.*60* BC–AD *20* (Oxford, 2007), 358–67 (fr. 219).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

will return to this fragment in the next section, but for now I want to highlight Severus' use of *facundia* to designate eloquence associated with Cicero (10–11):[29]

> abstulit una dies aeui decus, ictaque luctu
> conticuit Latiae tristis facundia linguae.
>
> One day took away the glory of an era, and, struck with grief,
> the eloquence of the Latin tongue fell silent in sadness.

facundia, then, when used to describe Cicero, on the one hand, evokes the eulogistic tradition associated with declamation and especially its incarnation in a historical poem by Cornelius Severus.[30] On the other hand, the word has strong Sallustian associations, and Sallust gave no room to Cicero's actual eloquence within his account of the Catilinarian conspiracy. The overall context of the line makes the problematic quality of Cicero's eloquence explicit, linking it to his advocacy of a bad cause, a weak argument. Together with the opening use of *eloquium* and its baggage of Drances' unscrupulous oratory, Lucan's language both evokes the declamatory topos of eloquence as central to Cicero's legacy and undercuts the positive valuation of that legacy through a dense web of allusions to texts that displace or denigrate his speech, establishing a tradition for his own figuring of Ciceronian eloquence as unscrupulous and self-serving. The use of *eloquium* in the opening phrase *Romani maximus auctor eloquii* adds to this tradition in two further ways. First, Cicero is an *auctor* of words, and words only, in contrast to his self-designation as the author of peace (in *Phil.* 7.8 *pacis semper laudator, semper auctor*; and in a letter to M. Marius, *Fam.* 7.3.2 *pacem cuius fueram semper auctor*); and second, the phrase *Romani maximus* recalls Catullus' mocking praise of the orator in poem 49, *dissertissime Romuli nepotum*.[31]

But as central as eloquence is to Lucan's depiction of Cicero in this episode, it is not the exclusive focus. *eloquium* and *facundia* frame Cicero's major political achievement, his suppression of Catiline, as underlying his advice to Pompey: *cuius sub iure togaque* | *pacificas saeuos tremuit Catilina securis* 'under whose civic command | savage Catiline trembled at the peacemaking axes'. The first part of this clause draws on the famous line from Cicero's own poetic account of his glorious accomplishment, *cedant arma togae* 'let arms yield to the toga', his claim to have suppressed the conspiracy peacefully, without resorting to violence[32] (and, even more closely, on its incorporation into the already mentioned obituary of Cicero in Cornelius Severus, where the orator is remembered as 'the protector [*uindex*] of justice and the toga' [*iurisque togaeque*], 14). Cicero's emphasis on the peaceful nature of his actions is further highlighted by

See also S. Feddern, *Die Suasorien des Älteren Seneca* (Berlin, 2013), 465–79. The only study devoted to the poet is H. Dahlmann, *Cornelius Severus* (Wiesbaden, 1975).

[29] The lines are a rewriting (and, according to Sen. *Suas.* 6.27, an improvement) of a line of Sextilius Ena, *deflendus Cicero est Latiaeque silentia linguae*. See Hollis (n. 28), 338–9 (fr. 202).

[30] See K. Volk and J. Zetzel, 'Laurel, tongue, and glory (Cicero, *De Consulatu Suo*, fr. 6 Soubiran)', *CQ* 65 (2015), 204–23, at 215 on its use by Pliny the Elder in his praise of Cicero's eloquence: *HN* 7.117 *facundiae Latiarumque litterarum parens*.

[31] For discussion, see Meunier (n. 3), 203–4; cf. Esposito (n. 1), 48. On the tone and the occasion of Catullus' poem there is no agreement; for discussion of the issues, see D. Selden, '*Ceueat lector*: Catullus and the rhetoric of performance', in R. Hexter and D. Selden (edd.), *Innovations of Antiquity* (New York, 1992), 461–512, at 464–7 and L. Roman, *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 2014), 84–8; see D.F.S. Thomson, *Catullus* (Toronto, 1997), 323–4 for earlier bibliography.

[32] *De Consulatu Suo* fr. 6 Soubiran = *FPL*^{4} 11 = Courtney (n. 28), 172 (fr. 12). The second half of the line is reported differently in different sources; see Volk and Zetzel (n. 30).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lucan's use of *pacificas* in contrast to *saeuus*, which describes Catiline. The textual tradition on Cicero's role in the conspiracy's demise, then, includes his own self-glorification, in poetry and prose, but also the sidelining of his character in Sallust. The choice of portraying Catiline as trembling brings into play another intertext: Virgil's vignette of Catiline in the Underworld, depicted on the Shield of Aeneas in Book 8 (*Aen.* 8.666–70):

> hinc procul addit
> Tartareas etiam sedes, alta ostia Ditis,
> et scelerum poenas, et te, Catilina, minaci
> pendentem scopulo Furiarumque ora trementem,
> secretosque pios, his dantem iura Catonem.
>
> On this side he added
> the seats of Tartarus, tall doors of Dis,
> and punishments for crimes, and you, Catiline,
> hanging off a jutting rock and trembling at the faces of the Furies,
> and the places set apart for the just, and Cato, giving laws to these.

By singling out Catiline in this scene Virgil identifies his conspiracy as one of the greatest transgressions against the Republic. Yet the man who suppressed the conspiracy is absent. Instead, through juxtaposition, Catiline as the arch-enemy of the Republic is opposed not to Cicero but to Cato as an ideal Republican figure.[33] The dynamic is reminiscent of the displacement of Cicero in Sallust's narrative, here seen in miniature.[34] While the trembling Catiline recalls this moment of displacement, the combination of *saeuus* and *securis* alludes to another prominent historical moment in Virgil's poem. This is a passage in the Parade of Heroes that describes a moment at the foundation of the Republic that combines peacemaking with problematic and tragic violence: Lucius Junius Brutus' execution of his sons for supporting the exiled King Tarquin (6.817–23):

> uis et Tarquinios reges animamque superbam
> ultoris Bruti, fascisque uidere receptos?
> consulis imperium hic primus saeuasque securis
> accipiet, natosque pater noua bella mouentis
> ad poenam pulchra pro libertate uocabit,
> infelix, utcumque ferent ea facta minores:
> uincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido.
>
> Do you wish to see the Tarquin kings and the proud spirit
> of the avenger Brutus, and the fasces received?
> This one will first take on the consul's authority and the savage axes,
> and he, a father, will call the sons that set the war in motion
> to punishment on behalf of beautiful liberty,
> unhappy, however the descendants shall take those actions:
> love of country will triumph and a limitless desire for praise.

[33] See L.M. Fratantuono and R.A. Smith, *Virgil,* Aeneid *8* (Leiden, 2018), 686 on 8.668 for discussion of possible hostility on Virgil's part. In drawing on this passage Lucan splits the two descriptors, taking Catiline's fear to the introduction of Cicero and keeping the threatening Catiline for the passage that parallels Virgil's, the account of the Underworld given by the corpse in Book 6 (6.793–4). There Catiline is also mentioned near Cato (6.789–90) and is characterized as *minax*.

[34] Cf. Gowing (n. 2), 235: 'Virgil has done what the historian Sallust could not or would not do, write Cicero out of Catiline's story.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This allusion undermines the claim of peaceful suppression, conveyed through *pacificas*, and by analogy calls to mind not only the violent end suffered by Catiline and his troops on the battlefield but especially Cicero's controversial and unprecedented execution of the arrested conspirators in Rome without trial.[35] In combining these two Virgilian references, the trembling of Catiline in the Underworld in *tremuit* from the Shield in Book 8 and the ambiguous axes, *saeuasque securis*, of Brutus from the Parade of Heroes, then, Lucan in effect allows the epithet *saeuus*, which has been transferred to Catiline, to linger behind and undermine the claims underlying *pacificas*.

My reading of Lucan's opening characterization of Cicero suggests that it goes beyond the 'reduced' Cicero model of declamation and beyond simple caricature resulting from anti-Ciceronian bias. Cicero the character is constructed by combining features of different textual versions of Cicero available to Lucan as well as Ciceronian absences and presences in Virgil and Sallust. Lucan's text presents an intertextually complex critique of Cicero's willingness to use violence in his suppression of Catiline's conspiracy, which manifests in part in an ahistorical transfer of Ciceronian violence to a moment in which Cicero was in fact on the side of peace, a role that Lucan denies his character.[36] Lucan's limited presentation leaves out other facets important in Ciceronian reception up to this time. There is no room in the *Bellum Ciuile* not only for Cicero's peacemaking but also for his prescient horror at the prospect of civil war. Lucan also makes no allusion to the orator's tragic death and dismemberment, and to the symbolic meaning given to his death in the tradition. But these parts of the Ciceronian tradition are not absent from the poem. Instead, they have been redirected to other characters within the text. This splitting is the subject of the next section.

ONE IN MANY: CICERONIAN PRESENCES IN THE *BELLVM CIVILE*

Ciceronian material outside his character's appearance in Book 7 has not gone unnoticed: scholars have studied Lucan's use of his speeches and especially of his correspondence as one among the sources that make up the Civil War fabric of the poem. The framework that I propose here reconfigures these moments of receptions in terms of epic and specifically the Virgilian technique of splitting the unified historical and textual figure of Cicero in the preceding tradition among multiple entities within Lucan's poem, and allows us to see the pattern into which these Ciceronian presences fall. Unlike the declamatory model of reducing and simplifying, which involves leaving out those facets of Cicero that do not fit the declaimers' streamlined picture, this model allows us to see that in Lucan the aspects of Cicero that do not appear in the episode in Book 7 are not left out of the poem, but are instead distributed to other characters.

Some of the reasons for this distribution are structural and analogous to what we saw in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, where the historian's focus on the central opposition between Cato and Caesar had the effect of making Cicero into a minor character.[37] In Lucan's poem a similar dynamic is at play: two of the prominent facets of

[35] Contra Narducci (n. 2), 81 (cf. id. [n. 3], 359 n. 86), who reads Lucan as correcting Virgil and accepting legitimate use of violence.

[36] Cf. La Bua (n. 2), 106.

[37] Sallust highlights the contrast between Cato and Caesar in competing speeches in the Senate debate on the fate of the conspirators, followed by a syncrisis, *Cat.* 51–4, while writing Cicero's *Fourth Catilinarian* out of his account.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ciceronian reception, Cicero the decapitated victim and Cicero the martyr whose death stands for the death of the Republic, cannot be actualized within the poem because those roles are played by more prominent characters, Pompey and Cato respectively. Yet the rhetorical and emotional energy that is associated with those facets of Cicero in the tradition is not lost, but is instead transferred to these other characters. Lucan privileges the death of Cato, to whose elevation to the role of the Republican martyr Cicero himself contributed shortly after his death,[38] over the death of Cicero. In doing so he can be said to be following a tradition of sorts, since both of his major models, Sallust and Virgil, have, as we saw, similarly suppressed Cicero in favour of Cato. But two other movements have a more significant influence on the fabric of Lucan's poem: the transfer of the language associated with Cicero and his death to Pompey and the reassignment both of the language derived from Cicero's peacemaking efforts and of his horror of civil war to the poem's narrator.

The transfer of the pathos associated with the tradition of Cicero's death is constructed along two main paths: through language from Cicero's own works and from Cornelius Severus' obituary of Cicero. As we saw in the previous section, Lucan's introduction of Cicero alludes both to Cicero's poem on his own consulship and to Cornelius Severus' death notice, but it frames them so as to critique Cicero's self-presentation and undermine Cornelius' eulogy. With that negative residue left with Cicero the character, both texts reappear, now positively inflected, applied to Pompey.

The lines describing Cicero's suppression of Catiline, *cuius sub iure togaque | pacificas saeuos tremuit Catilina securis* (7.63–4), allude, as we saw, to the famous line from the *De Consulatu Suo*, *cedant arma togae*, but combine the allusion with Virgilian intertexts in such a way as to undercut the orator's central claim and implicate him in illegitimate use of violence, leaving no room for his peacemaking efforts in the context of civil war. The line resurfaces in the narrator's outburst following the report of Pompey's humble burial (8.813–14): *dic semper ab armis | ciuilem repetisse togam* 'say that always he turned back to the toga after war', and in Cato's eulogy of Pompey in Book 9 (9.199): *praetulit arma togae, sed pacem armatus amauit* 'he preferred arms to the toga, but, though armed, loved peace'. In alluding to this line in his portrait of Cicero, Lucan privileged the role of the axes, *securis*, the equivalent of *arma*, emerging after the consul's *toga*, suggesting that the apparent commitment to peace was covering the underlying violence. In these passages, both the narrator and Cato recognize that Pompey is first and foremost a military man, yet emphasize peace as his primary motivation, once again suggesting that, unlike Cicero's claim to prefer civic means and peace, Pompey's is the true commitment.[39] The transfer is particularly pointed since it seems that Cicero's line could be taken, following the poem's circulation, as offensive to Pompey the general specifically.[40] The splitting of the allusion reconfigures the positive

[38] On Cicero's contribution to the formation of the myth of Cato, see J. Hall, 'Serving the times: Cicero and Caesar the dictator', in W.J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite and P.A. Roche (edd.), *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome* (Leiden, 2009), 89–110, at 94–9; H. Wassmann, *Ciceros Widerstand gegen Caesars Tyrannis: Untersuchungen zur politischen Bedeutung der philosophischen Spätschriften* (Bonn, 1996), 139–59; cf. R. Stem, 'Cicero and the legacy of Cato Uticensis' (Diss., University of Michigan, 1999).

[39] E. Narducci, 'Cicerone poeta in Lucano', *MD* 7 (1982), 177–84, at 177–8 discusses the relationship between 9.199 and 7.63–4 as polar opposites. For 9.199 in relation to 8.813–14, see C. Wick, *M. Annaeus Lucanus: "Bellum Civile", Liber IX. Kommentar* (Munich, 2004), 74 ad loc.

[40] See Volk and Zetzel (n. 30), 209–11 on Cicero's response to Piso's interpretation of his line in this vein in *Pis.* 74.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

claims that Cicero had made in the poem for his own achievements and redirects their affective weight toward Pompey.

A similar dynamic, but at a higher level of complexity and detail, is at work in Lucan's appropriation of the Cornelius Severus passage that we know from Seneca's *suasoria*, a text that expresses sentiments familiar from declamation, but generically belongs in the tradition of historical epic about which we know too little.[41] As we saw in the previous section, Severus marked Cicero's passing as having silenced the eloquence of the Latin tongue, *Latinae facundia linguae*, with grief, and Lucan's use of *facundia* in the closing line of his introduction of Cicero partly recalls this central moment of Severus' obituary. The rest of the obituary, on the one hand, focusses on the horror of the physical violence done to Cicero and, on the other, praises his political achievements, with a particular focus on the suppression of Catiline. Both the description of the violence and the general presentation of Cicero's role as statesman and leader beloved by the people are redirected by Lucan to the character of Pompey.[42] The passage as Seneca quotes it runs as follows (Sen. *Suas.* 6.26 = Cornelius Severus, fr. 13):

> oraque magnanimum spirantia paene uirorum
> in rostris iacuere suis. sed enim abstulit omnis,
> tamquam sola foret, rapti Ciceronis imago.
> tunc redeunt animis ingentia consulis acta
> iurataeque manus deprensaque foedera noxae
> patriciumque nefas; extincti poena Cethegi
> deiectusque redit uotis Catilina nefandis.
> quid fauor aut coetus, pleni quid honoribus anni
> profuerant, sacris exculta quid artibus aetas?
> abstulit una dies aeui decus, ictaque luctu
> conticuit Latiae tristis facundia linguae.
> unica sollicitis quondam tutela salusque,
> egregium semper patriae caput, ille senatus
> uindex, ille fori, legum iurisque togaeque,
> publica uox saeuis aeternum obmutuit armis.
> informes uoltus sparsamque cruore nefando
> canitiem sacrasque manus operumque ministras
> tantorum pedibus ciuis proiecta superbis
> proculcauit ouans nec lubrica fata deosque
> respexit. nullo luet hoc Antonius aeuo.
> hoc nec in Emathio mitis uictoria Perse
> nec te, dire Syphax, non fecit <in> hoste Philippo,
> inque triumphato ludibria cuncta Iugurtha
> afuerunt, nostraeque cadens ferus Hannibal irae
> membra tamen Stygias tulit inuiolata sub umbras.

> And the faces of great-spirited men, almost breathing,
> lay on their rostra. But the image of ravaged Cicero
> grabbed the attention away from all, as if it were the only one.
> Then the tremendous acts of the consul come to mind
> and the hands that swore together and the harmful compacts that he apprehended
> and the patrician danger he suppressed; the punishment of Cethegus
> and Catiline deflected from his abominable plans come to mind.
> What good did the favour of the crowd, what good the years filled

[41] Sen. *Suas.* 6.26. For the fragment and its later intertexts, see Dahlmann (n. 28), 74–119.

[42] Dahlmann (n. 28), 74–119 comments on the general similarity in tenor between the Severus passage and the two eulogies of Pompey in the *Bellum Ciuile* (Dahlmann [n. 28], 77–8) and discusses many of the verbal echoes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with honours of office, what a lifetime cultivated in sacred arts?
One day took away the glory of an age, and struck by grief
the eloquence of the Latin tongue fell silent in sadness.
Once the only guardian and safety for those in trouble,
always the outstanding head of the fatherland, that protector
of the Senate, of the forum, or laws, and justice, and the toga,
the voice of the people fell forever silent because of savage arms.
Mangled face and grey hair splattered with unspeakable blood
and sacred hands that worked such great deeds
thrown before proud feet a fellow-citizen
trampled in triumph without regard for instability of fates or the gods.
Antony will not atone for this in any length of time.
A thing like this a gentle victory did not do in the case of Emathian Perses,
nor you, dread Syphax, nor the enemy, Philip,
and when Jugurtha was led in triumph, mockery
was absent, and fierce Hannibal, when he fell victim to our anger,
still took his limbs intact under the Stygian shades.

Lucan appropriates Severus' graphic description of Cicero's mangled face and grey hair for his Pompey, but not at the moment of his decapitation. Instead, it appears at the moment when Cornelia sees the defeated Pompey arriving on Lesbos (8.55–7):

notauit
deformem pallore ducem uoltusque prementem
canitiem atque atro squalentis puluere uestes.

She saw
the leader deformed by pallor and his grey hair pressing
on his face and clothes filthy with black dust.

Cornelia's first glimpse of her husband is derived from Severus' poem (*informes uoltus* in Severus, *deformem* and *uoltus* in Lucan, both next to *canitiem*).[43] The intertextual presence of Cicero's severed head gives additional meaning to this moment, which foreshadows Pompey's death and decapitation, which she will not be able to see close up. But it also takes away from Cicero the horror and pathos that Severus' poem gives to him as a victim and assigns it to Pompey, with an increased emotional force since the vision is here focalized through the distraught wife.[44] The same process is at work in Lucan's treatment of Severus' description of Cicero as statesman. Severus' distinctive use of *uindex senatus* to describe Cicero's role is redirected to Pompey by the narrator in his indignant address to Ptolemy as Pompey's boat nears the Egyptian shore and his death (8.554).[45] Both moments are highly charged and foreshadow the general's gruesome death.

Severus also marks his Cicero as particularly favoured by the people, *fauor et coetus*, and as the orator who expresses the popular will, *publica uox*. This characterization, too,

[43] Another intertext that foreshadows Pompey's death and mistreatment of his corpse here is to Virgil's Hector, *raptatus bigis ut quondam, aterque cruento | puluere perque pedes traiectus lora tumentis* (*Aen.* 2.272–3), *squalentem barbam et concretos sanguine crinis* (2.277): see McClellan (n. 21), 76–7.

[44] An emotional account of Pompey's death given by his son, 9.125–45, similarly emphasizes the dismemberment and the ignominious treatment of the general's head.

[45] It is there inserted among achievements more commonly associated with Pompey's military achievements, 8.553–5 *non domitor mundi nec ter Capitolia curru | inuectus regumque potens uindex senatus | uictorisque gener …*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is split: Lucan's Cicero is presented as expressing the will of the dissatisfied soldiers, *cunctorum uoces*, but the favour of the people belongs to Lucan's Pompey, if only in the past: it is at the centre of Pompey's dream the night before Pharsalus, which opens the seventh book (*populi facies clamorque fauentis*, 7.13).

The Ciceronian language from Severus reappears after Pompey is killed. Severus draws attention to both the head and the hands of Cicero, notoriously placed on the rostra, and applies the epithet *sacrae* to the hands in particular, as responsible for Cicero's actions. The epithet focalizes the narrator's horror at the murderers' outrage.[46] Lucan transfers the epithet from Cicero's hands to Pompey's head, using it twice in the passage that graphically describes the decapitation (8.667–78):

> nam saeuus in ipso
> Septimius sceleris maius scelus inuenit actu,
> ac retegit sacros scisso uelamine uoltus
> semianimis Magni spirantiaque occupat ora
> collaque in obliquo ponit languentia transtro.
> tunc neruos uenasque secat nodosaque frangit
> ossa diu: nondum artis erat caput ense rotare.
> at, postquam trunco ceruix abscisa recessit,
> uindicat hoc Pharius, dextra gestare, satelles.
> degener atque operae miles Romane secundae,
> Pompei diro sacrum caput ense recidis,
> ut non ipse feras? o summi fata pudoris!
>
> For savage Septimius
> in the very performance of the crime finds a greater crime,
> and, tearing up the cloak that covered it, reveals the sacred face
> of half-dead Magnus and takes his breathing head
> and feeble neck and places them at an angle on a rowers' bank.
> Then he cuts the sinews and the veins and breaks the joints,
> taking a long time: not yet was it an art to send heads rolling with a sword.
> But, after the neck, cut off, was removed from the trunk,
> the Egyptian accomplice claims the right to carry it with his right hand.
> Roman soldier, degenerate in acting this secondary part,
> you cut the sacred head of Pompey with your dreadful sword
> so that you would carry it yourself? O fate of greatest shame!

While Severus focusses, in an emotionally powerful way, on the distinctive feature of Cicero's demise—the importance of his hands, cut off and nailed to the rostra together with his head—Lucan reassigns the charged epithet to Pompey's head, and thereby diverts the emotional force from Cicero's death to the earlier and, in Lucan's text, more important crime, the murder of Pompey. The phrase *spirantia ora*, which opens the Severus passage, refers there to multiple victims, but can refer to Cicero only metaphorically, since his head had been transported to Rome. In Lucan it has been made literal, since Pompey is in fact still breathing.[47]

[46] A. Richlin, 'Cicero's head', in J.I. Porter (ed.), *Constructions of the Classical Body* (Ann Arbor, 1999), 190–211 explores the meaning of decapitation in Roman culture.

[47] T. Biggs, '*Cicero, quid in alieno saeculo tibi?* The "Republican" rostra between Caesar and Augustus', in S. Rebeggiani, M. Loar and S. Murray (edd.), *The Cultural History of Augustan Rome: Texts, Monuments, and Topography* (Cambridge, 2019), 27–44, at 39–43 connects *spirantia ora* here to *spirantia aera* in Anchises' speech in Verg. *Aen.* 6.847 in a productive reading of the *imago* of Cicero and others in Cornelius Severus in relation to statues on the rostra.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The intertextual presence of Cornelius Severus' Cicero in Lucan's text, then, works alongside the more limited allusion to Cicero's own historical poem to transfer to Pompey the praise given to Cicero's political achievements and the sorrow over his tragic death.[48] This validation of Pompey at the expense of Cicero is also accomplished by using Cicero's own words. By calling him *rector*, alluding to the title *rector rei publicae* which Cicero gives his ideal statesman in *De republica*, Lucan marks Pompey as an ideal Ciceronian statesman.[49] The significance of this designation, used of Pompey twice, is clear from its placement. The first time it directly follows Cicero's speech urging him to enter battle in Book 7 (7.85–6):

> ingemuit rector sensitque deorum
> esse dolos et fata suae contraria menti.
>
> The leader groaned and sensed that
> these were tricks of the gods and fates contrary to his intention.

The use of *rector* here points to Cicero's failure by invoking his political ideal at the moment when he pushes the man who, it is implied, most closely embodies that ideal into a disastrous battle against his better judgement.[50] *rector* is used for a second time in a way that is reminiscent of the phrase *uindex senatus* in Cato's eulogy of Pompey (9.194–5):[51]

> rectorque senatus,
> sed regnantis, erat.
>
> He was the leader of the Senate,
> but the Senate was still in charge.

Cato's formulation points to the possible monarchical interpretation of Cicero's *rector*, and rejects it in the case of Pompey.

In addition to these intertextual transfers, it is plausible that Lucan's text borrows a structural element from the narrative of Cicero's death: the agent of his burial.[52] According to Plutarch, it was Pompey's freedman Philippus who buried the decapitated body of the general (*Pomp.* 80). In Lucan's text, instead, it is an otherwise virtually unattested *quaestor* named Cordus, most likely an invented character.[53] This scene of

[48] As far as we know; it is possible that, if we had more of the *De Consulatu Suo*, we could see more of it in Lucan as well.

[49] Cic. *Rep.* 2.51 with J. Zetzel, *Cicero De Re Publica: Selections* (Cambridge, 1995), 205–6 ad loc. J. Zarecki, *Cicero's Ideal Statesman in Theory and Practice* (London, 2014) is a recent treatment that argues for the importance of the concept to Cicero's practice; he makes a case (69–76) for the influence of Pompey's sole consulship on Cicero's ideal statesman.

[50] Cf. F.M. Ahl, *Lucan: An Introduction* (Ithaca, 1976), 162, who assumes that Pompey is the model for Cicero's *rector*.

[51] Cf. Narducci (n. 2), 89–90.

[52] For a detailed discussion of Pompey's death, funeral and laments over him in the poem, see McClellan (n. 21), 120–43, with 68–78 on decapitation; cf. M. Erasmo, *Reading Death in Ancient Rome* (Columbus, 2008), 109–27 with an emphasis on Lucan's manipulations of Roman funerary ritual.

[53] The only other mention of Cordus is in [Aur. Vict.] *De uir. ill.* 77.9. See C. Santini, 'Scenari temporali alternative per *il Bellum Civile* di Lucano', *Prometheus* 33 (2007), 37–48, at 39; Fucecchi (n. 2), 254–5. D.B. Brennan, 'Cordus and the burial of Pompey', *CPh* 64 (1969), 103–4 suggests that the name is a homage to Cremutius Cordus, a historian whose death notice for Cicero is among those cited in the sixth *suasoria* of Seneca the Elder. A. Ambühl, *Krieg und Bürgerkrieg*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pompey's burial, with its emphasis on *pietas*,[54] is likely derived from the story that Cicero's decapitated body was buried by his friend Lamia, known to us from a late source, the Latin Anthology.[55] If, as Susan Treggiari suggests, the source for this account is Livy,[56] then Lucan could be following, in this respect, too, the tradition surrounding Cicero's death and transferring the humble burial motivated by *pietas* to his decapitated victim of choice.[57]

Another positive aspect of Cicero's legacy, the positive efforts that Cicero made toward peace in the lead-up to the Civil War, undergoes an analogous process of reassignment. Scholars have long noticed the presence of language from Cicero's letters in the poem. Recently, Daniela Galli has synthesized the previously collected echoes, thematic and verbal, and added new material.[58] For my argument the most important of them is the appropriation of the voice of Cicero the peacemaker in the narrator's attempts to protest the impending disaster of the Civil War: within the framework of splitting Cicero, then, this facet has been transferred to the narrator. A good example of this transfer is a passage in Book 1, in which the narrator evokes the first triumvirate as the beginning of the disastrous conflict (1.87–99):[59]

> o male concordes nimiaque cupidine caeci,
> quid miscere iuuat uires orbemque tenere
> in medio? dum terra fretum terramque leuabit
> aer et longi uoluent Titana labores
> noxque diem caelo totidem per signa sequetur,
> nulla fides regni sociis, omnisque potestas
> inpatiens consortis erit. nec gentibus ullis
> credite nec longe fatorum exempla petantur:
> fraterno primi maduerunt sanguine muri.
> nec pretium tanti tellus pontusque furoris
> tunc erat: exiguum dominos commisit asylum.
> temporis angusti mansit concordia discors
> paxque fuit non sponte ducum …

bei Lucan und in der griechischen Literatur (Berlin, 2015), 281 n. 249 derives the name from *cor*, on analogy with Sophocles' *Antigone*, and R. Scarcia, 'Morte e (in)sepoltura di Pompeo', in G. Brugnoli and F. Stok (edd.), *Pompei exitus: variazioni sul tema dall'antichità alla controriforma* (Pisa, 1996), 125–48, at 135 n. 25 locates the source of his position, *quaestor*, in his search for Pompey's body (*quaesitum* 8.719).

[54] Cordus' *pietas* overcomes his fear, Luc. 7.717–19 *ille per umbras* | *ausus ferre gradum uictum pietate timorem* | *conpulit*; his actions substitute for the filial *pietas* the Romans owe Pompey, 7.732 *ut Romana suum gestent pia colla parentem*; and *pietas* recurs as motivation at the end of the ceremony, 7.785–6 *cogit pietas inponere finem* | *officio*.

[55] In the cycle of twelve epitaphs within the *Symposium XII Sapientes*, Lamia is mentioned three times—*Sap.* 114.6 (= *Anth. Lat.* 608), *Sap.* 117.6 (= *Anth. Lat.* 611) and *Sap.* 120.1 (= *Anth. Lat.* 614)—and referred to as *amicus* at 109.1 (= *Anth. Lat.* 603), the first line of the cycle. See A. Friedrich, *Das Symposium der XII sapientes* (Berlin, 2002), 213–16; for what we know about Lamia, see H.H. Davis, 'Cicero's burial', *Phoenix* 12 (1958), 174–7; S. Treggiari, 'Cicero, Horace, and mutual friends: Lamiae and Varrones Murenae', *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 245–61, at 246–53.

[56] Treggiari (n. 55), 249.

[57] Lamia's *pietas*: *Sap.* 120.1 *Cicero est Lamiae pietate sepultus*; it is implicit in all the mentions. Cordus' *pietas*: 8.756–7, with N. Coffee, 'Social relations in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*', in P. Asso (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Lucan* (Leiden, 2011), 417–32, at 422.

[58] D. Galli, 'Lucano lettore di Cicerone', in P. Esposito and C. Walde (edd.), *Letture e lettori di Lucano* (Pisa, 2015), 73–84; cf. E. Malcovati, 'Lucano e Cicerone', *Athenaeum* 41 (1953), 288–97; V. Holliday, *Pompey in Cicero's "Correspondence" and Lucan's "Civil War"* (The Hague, 1969). See also Baertschi (n. 3), 58–61 for an overview of Cicero's attitudes to peace and the competing generals in the correspondence of the early 40s.

[59] Discussed by Galli (n. 58), 75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Allied, but badly, and blind from excess of desire,
> why does it please you to conjoin your power and to hold the world
> together? As long as earth supports the sea, the air, the earth,
> and long toils cause the Sun to come around
> and night follows day in the sky, as many times, through the constellations,
> there is no loyalty in royal power, and all domination
> will not endure a consort. Don't trust any other nations,
> no need to look for examples of such fates far away:
> the first walls were wet with a brother's blood.
> And then it wasn't the earth or the sea that was the price of madness:
> it was the small asylum that set the masters against each other.
> For a short time the discordant agreement held
> and there was peace, though not by the will of the leaders …

The sentiments that underlie the poetic expressions of *concordia discors*, here and elsewhere in the poem, are derived from Cicero's repeated discussion, found especially in his letters to Atticus, of the instability of agreements between the powerful generals and the inevitability of the clash between Pompey and Caesar given both men's desire for control, which Cicero characterizes in the language of absolute power, *regnum* and *dominatio*.[60] Galli rightly cites a passage from *Att*. 8.11.2 (SB 161), which presents in condensed form these accusations directed against both men: *dominatio quaesita ab utroque est; … uterque regnare uult* 'each man is looking for absolute power; … each wants to reign'. But we can get a better understanding of how these Ciceronian sentiments are deployed in Lucan's poem if we do not limit ourselves to specific correspondences, but look at the letter as a whole.

Cicero begins this letter, written on 27 February 49, by responding to Atticus' concern about his emotional state: his friend had felt that Cicero was greatly disturbed (*me magno animi motu perturbatum*). Cicero acknowledges his general state of worry, *cura*, and proceeds to qualify it by saying that worrying does no good, and that he has tried to direct his energies to contemplating his portrait of *rector rei publicae* in *De republica*, quoting Scipio in Book 5 (the term used is *moderator* rather than *rector*).[61] Immediately following the quotation, Cicero attacks Pompey by name: *hoc Gnaeus noster cum antea numquam tum in hac causa minime cogitauit* 'this [the task of the ideal statesman] our Gnaeus has never considered before, and least of all in this current matter'. It is in the context of this bitter disappointment in Pompey that the accusations of *dominatio* and *regnum* directed at both Pompey and Caesar come. Cicero is unsurprised by Caesar; equating the two is a jab at Pompey. This broader context brings the intertextual dynamic for Lucan's narrator's adoption of the Ciceronian tone more sharply into focus. The narrator has taken on the basic emotional tenor of apprehension, but amplifies it. In the same letter, Cicero rejects unrestrained

[60] Instability: Galli (n. 58) cites *Att.* 7.1.3 (= SB 124) *tanta erat illorum coniunctio, nunc impendet, ut et tu ostendis ego uideo, summa inter eos contentio*; for the inevitability of the clash, see I. Gildenhardt, 'Reckoning with tyranny: Greek thoughts on Caesar in Cicero's Letters to Atticus in early 49', in S. Lewis (ed.), *Ancient Tyranny* (Edinburgh, 2006), 197–209 for the letters from early 49 B.C.E.; cf. Holliday (n. 58), especially 29–31 on 'Pompey as *dynastēs*'; see also A. Casamento, *La parola e la guerra: rappresentazioni letterarie del* Bellum Civile *in Lucano* (Bologna, 2005), 24–37 on Lucan's portrayal of Caesar and Pompey with a focus on connections to the conflict between Marius and Sulla.

[61] See S. McConnell, *Philosophical Life in Cicero's Letters* (Cambridge, 2014), 93–6 for the philosophical foundations of this letter. McConnell reads Cicero as positioning himself as the *moderator* in light of the others' failure. See also McConnell (this note), 96–100 on the centrality of *concordia* in letters from this period in relation to Plato's *Seventh Letter*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lament as unproductive (8.11.1): *lamentari autem licet illud quidem totos dies* 'one could, however, lament the situations all day long'. Lucan's narrator embraces it. He also shares some of Cicero's disappointment in Pompey, seen in the double address like the one quoted above, but Caesar is his main target: he recovers for his Pompey the claim to come closest to being the *rector rei publicae*, denied to him explicitly by Cicero in this letter.

Cicero's correspondence shows how aware he was of the catastrophic potential consequences of the conflict, how wary of both sides and their leaders, and how desperate to stop it. In a certain sense, Cicero's foresight here is the exact opposite of his decision to execute the conspirators, the decision that has been treated as contributing, as a precedent, to the gradual dismantling of legal constraints that culminated in the very civil conflict he then tried to prevent.[62] When Cicero was forced to choose sides, he chose Pompey, but half-heartedly, seeing him as the better of the two alternatives, but very aware of his limitations and of dangers that would follow should he win. Within the world of Lucan's poem there is no character who occupies this position, the position of a peacemaker who reluctantly and half-heartedly chooses a side. Cicero himself, as a character, is in fact assigned the exact opposite role, giving the hesitant Pompey the final push to join battle. Some of his hesitations and his suspicions of Pompey, should he win, are given to Cato, who voices them in his speech to Brutus (2.286–323).[63] But the spirit of the Ciceronian reaction to the prospect of civil war, in an amplified form, is what animates much of what we hear from the poem's narrator: with the benefit of hindsight, the narrator expresses his horror at the conflict and rhetorically gestures toward his efforts to avert the conflict by repeatedly turning away and refusing to narrate its progression.[64] Even the narrator's complex (and contested) attitude to the character of Pompey is, as we saw, a modified version of Cicero's reluctant preference. Just as Sallust the historian had taken over the role of Cicero the consul who discovered and stopped the conspiracy, Lucan the narrator, then, has displaced and replaced Cicero: he made him into an irresponsible warmonger, while taking onto himself the role of the peacemaker horrified at the inevitable damage to the *res publica*.

CONCLUSION

Cicero's presence in Lucan's poem is not limited to the distorted picture in Book 7 and to the borrowing of language from Cicero's letters. In creating the apparent caricature in Book 7, Lucan in fact presents an intertextually complex critique of Cicero's willingness to use violence in his suppression of Catiline's conspiracy. This emphasis contributes to

[62] H.I. Flower, *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture* (Chapel Hill, 2006), 101–2.

[63] See especially 2.320–2 *nec, si fortuna fauebit, | hunc quoque totius sibi ius promittere mundi | non bene conpertum est*. 2.318, *regnare uolenti*, is Ciceronian not only in spirit but also in expression. I thank the journal's anonymous reader for drawing my attention to the speech.

[64] Cf. J. Henderson, *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War* (Cambridge, 1998), 183: 'This narrator loathes the progress of his story of Caesarian triumph, loves *mora*, delay, obstruction, diversion.' For the peculiar temporality that results as Lucan, from the future, looks forward to Pompey's defeat and the death of the Republic, see E.V. Mulhern, 'Lucan's nostalgia and the infection of memory', in L. Zientek and M. Thorne (edd.), *Lucan's Imperial World: The* Bellum Civile *in its Contemporary Contexts* (London, 2020), 209–28.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the denial to Cicero of any credit for his later peacemaking efforts and prescient horror at the prospect of civil war, which is instead transferred to the narrator. The negative slant also denies any place for the foreshadowing of Cicero's tragic death and dismemberment, and the rhetorical force associated with the representation of his death is granted instead to Lucan's preferred decapitated victim, Pompey, while some of the energy associated with the symbolic quality of his death may be redirected to Cato's suicide. In the context of a poem obsessed with dismembered bodies,[65] this intertextual procedure itself becomes an act of dismemberment,[66] with Lucan performing Cicero's dismemberment and death anew by denying him any of the declamatory pathos. In doing so he also, following Sallust, overwrites Cicero, with the poem's narrator appropriating his role as the peacemaker. Lucan's dismemberment of Cicero is an act of textual violence. Yet inevitably, in taking on Cicero's goals and his horror of the conflict, he also takes on the despairing affect that accompanied his efforts. And he knowingly takes on Cicero's failure.

Princeton University Y. BARAZ
ybaraz@princeton.edu

[65] On dismemberment and violence in Lucan, see S. Bartsch, *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's* Civil War (Cambridge, MA, 1997); M. Dinter, *Anatomizing* Civil War*: Studies in Lucan's Epic Technique* (Ann Arbor, 2012); McClellan (n. 21), 120–42 and 115–69; in Neronian literature, G. Most, '*Disiecta membra poetae*: the rhetoric of dismemberment in Neronian poetry', in R. Hexter and D. Selden (edd.), *Innovations of Antiquity* (New York, 1992), 391–419.

[66] The image of poetic text as a body, dismembered when its unity is disturbed, goes back to Arist. *Poet.* 8.1451a30–5 and receives its definitive Latin formulation in Horace's *disiecti membra poetae* (*Sat*. 1.4.62); for the critical tradition underlying Horace's image, see K. Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton, 1993), 145–50; on the Horatian textual body in the *Sermones* and the *Odes*, see J. Farrell, 'Horace's body, Horace's books', in S.J. Heyworth, P.G. Fowler and S.J. Harrison (edd.), *Classical Constructions: Papers in Memory of Don Fowler, Classicist and Epicurean* (Oxford, 2007), 174–93.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000951 Published online by Cambridge University Press