

GELLÉRFI GERGŐ
(UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED)

TROY, ITALY, AND THE UNDERWORLD
(LUCAN, 9, 964–999)

Julius Caesar, one of the protagonists of Lucan's Pharsalia, disappears from the scene for a long time after the Battle of Pharsalus. He reappears at the end of Book 9, when he pays a visit to the ruined city of Troy. The function and the source of this historically unsupported scene are both worth examining. Earlier research disclosed as the literary source of the Troy scene the episode in Aeneid Book 8, when Evander shows Aeneas the future site of Rome. While fully accepting that, I would like to present another possible source that might have as much effect on the constructing of Lucan's Troy as the Evander-scene: the katabasis in Book 6 of the Aeneid. Definite parallelisms can be identified between the two scenes on both motivic and textual levels. Furthermore, the connection between these three scenes can be proved on the level of content, since by examining them together the real purpose of the Troy scene can be decoded: Lucan predicts Rome's destruction in this episode.

Keywords: Lucan, *Pharsalia*, Caesar, Troy, *Aeneid*, katabasis, Civil War

Julius Caesar, one of the protagonists of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, disappears from the scene for a long time after the Battle of Pharsalus. He reappears at the end of Book 9, when he pursues his son-in-law, Pompey, who, unknown to Caesar, is already dead. After arriving in Troy he interrupts his pursuit in order to explore the ruined city. This thirty-six-line section can be divided into three parts: in the first, Caesar walks through the ruined city, thus giving the author the opportunity to recall the Trojan past (LUCAN. 9, 964–979). A seven-line interjection by the poet follows, in which Lucan in his own voice talks about the role of poets and about his epic (LUCAN. 9, 980–986). At the end of the scene we return to Troy, where Caesar erects an altar of turf and offers a sacrifice in the old home of the Roman gods (LUCAN. 9, 987–999).

The scene does not have any basis in history,¹ but maybe it has a historical source: the Trojan visit of Alexander.² The most important ancient sources for this are Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* (PLUT. *Alex.* 15), and the *Pro Archia poeta* of Cicero (CIC. *Arch.* 24). Both of them inform us that Alexander, standing in front of the tomb of Achilles in Troy, commended the good fortune of Achilles in having a man like Homer to sing his praises. The function³ and the literary source of the scene in the *Pharsalia* have been the subject of research in the past already. Most scholars have said that the main literary source of the Troy scene is the episode in Book 8 of the *Aeneid* in which Evander guides Aeneas around the future site of Rome.⁴ In this Virgilian scene the narrator recites the prophecy to the reader. Evander reveals the events of the future to Aeneas: he refers to the she-wolf who would care for Romulus and Remus (VERG. *Aen.* 8, 342–343), and indicates the places of buildings as yet non-existent, among them the future site of the Capitol (VERG. *Aen.* 8, 347–348). Evander's presence is crucial for Aeneas to understand the significance of this place, a significance he would not be able to grasp without Evander's explanation. In the Troy scene of the *Pharsalia* Lucan twice mentions that a Phrygian native guides Caesar around the ruined city, making the guide's character the counterpart

-
- 1 We have no sources saying that Caesar visited the ruined Troy. Though he writes in Book 3 of his *De bello civili* that he stayed in Asia Minor while pursuing Pompey, neither he nor Plutarch mentions Troy, while Plutarch presents Alexander's visit to Troy in his parallel biography of them. Suetonius, the periochae of Livy and Florus do not even refer to the visit to Asia Minor.
- 2 According to *Zwierlein*, the motivation of the scene is that Lucan wanted to draw a parallel between Caesar and Alexander at the end of Book 9 and in the opening of Book 10. ZWIERLEIN (1986: 464–465). The key to this parallel can be found in lines 34–35 of Book 10, where Lucan compares Alexander to a thunderbolt which struck all peoples equally: *fulmenque quod omnis / percuteret pariter populos*. This metaphor evokes Caesar's first appearance in the *Pharsalia* (LUCAN. 1, 151–157), where in contrast with Pompey, who is compared to an elderly, dry oak, Caesar appears as a thunderbolt which frightens the people (*Rosner–Siegel* writes about this passage in detail: ROSNER–SIEGEL 1983. 165–177). The parallel drawn by Lucan between Alexander and Caesar strengthens the theory that the Trojan scene of the Alexander-tradition was the historical precedent for Caesar's visit to Troy. This parallel can in no way be positive for Caesar, as in the opening of Book 10 Lucan twice calls Alexander *vaesanus*: *illic Pellaei proles vaesana Philippi, / felix praedo, iacet* (LUCAN. 10, 21–22); *occurrit suprema dies, naturaque solum / hunc potuit finem vaesano ponere regi* (LUCAN. 10, 41–42).
- 3 Of the papers dealing with the function of the Troy scene it is important to mention *Masters'* observation that a circle became complete when the protagonist of the last epic war, Lucan's Caesar, returned to the city of the first epic war. MASTERS (1992: 158).
- 4 This parallel is among others summarized by *Wick*: WICK (2004: 405–406).

of Evander, while their functions mirror each other: Evander points out the places of future buildings, but Caesar's guide shows him the places of buildings which have been destroyed.

With fully accepting that, I will present another possible source from the *Aeneid*, which also could have great effect on the construction of Lucan's Troy: the *katabasis* in Book 6. A definite parallelism can be identified between the locations of the two scenes: the Sibyl guides Aeneas in "the kingdom of death", and – maybe not as categorically as the Underworld – typologically Lucan's depiction of the ruined Troy may give the reader the same impression. This is suggested by the keywords used to describe the city of Troy: the mention of the *manes* (LUCAN. 9, 975), the participle *exustae* (LUCAN. 9, 964), and such expressions as *silvae steriles* (LUCAN. 9, 966) and *periere ruinae* (LUCAN. 9, 969).⁵

There are other convincing similarities between the Troy scene and the *katabasis*. One of these is the dramaturgical motivation of both scenes: both are preceded by a voyage. Caesar pursues Pompey on the sea, while Aeneas arrives on the shores of Cumae after the death of Palinurus; there he meets the Sibyl and begins his journey to the Underworld. The next lines of the Troy scene also show parallelism with the *katabasis*: both show us a kind of catalogue in connection with the wandering of the epic heroes in Troy and in the Underworld. In the *Aeneid*, between Aeneas' entering the Underworld and his meeting with Anchises we can read three different lists of the deceased. First, Virgil lists victims of tragic love: among others, the poet mentions Phaedra, Pasiphaë, Laodamia and Dido (VERG. *Aen.* 6, 445–451). Not much later follow lists of those killed in war (VERG. *Aen.* 6, 477–495) and of the souls of the wicked (VERG. *Aen.* 6, 580–601). In

⁵ The last two expressions can be important from other aspects of interpreting the Troy scene. In *Ahl's* opinion the *silvae steriles* (LUCAN. 9, 966), together with *putres robore trunci* (LUCAN. 9, 966) and *lassa radice* (LUCAN. 9, 968), recall the description of Pompey as a dry oak in Book 1 (138–140), after Lucan says that he is only "the shadow of his 'Great' name", *magni nominis umbra* LUCAN. 1, 135). This expression shows a very strong parallel with *memorable nomen* (LUCAN. 9, 964) from the first line of the Troy scene, AHL (1976: 215). *Shadi Bartsch* returns to this thought and states that the Troy scene represents Pompey, so Caesar's Phrygian guide – who will be mentioned later in my paper – did the same thing with Troy that Lucan did with Pompey: they gave content to an empty name. *Bartsch* notes the expression *etiam periere ruinae* (LUCAN. 9, 969) in observing this parallel, and says "at Troy, the ruins themselves were already ruined; for Rome, Pompey's death stole away a belief in liberty that was already make-believe" BARTSCH (1997: 135). The arguments of *Ahl* and *Bartsch* are very convincing, but in my opinion it is not possible to apply this metaphor to the whole scene, since after line 969 there is no element that suggests that the whole scene is a complex Pompey-allegory.

the Troy scene, in association with places visited by Caesar Lucan recalls some famous Trojans, either mentioning them by name or referring to them unambiguously (LUC. 9, 970–973). There is a further parallel between Aeneas' *katabasis* and Lucan's Trojan scene: the visiting of different places. In a twenty-line section Virgil presents four different regions of the Underworld (VERG. *Aen.* 6, 426–444): the regions of people who died in infancy, victims of false accusations, those who committed suicide, and *Lugentes campi*, the region of victims of tragic love. The list of Trojan sites in the *Pharsalia* (LUCAN. 9, 970–979) consists of the aforementioned places referring to famous Trojans, the river Xanthus, the tomb of Hector, and the altar of Zeus Herceius. The parallel lists in the *Pharsalia* are, of course, much shorter, which can be adequately explained by the difference in length of the two scenes: the *katabasis* is more than four hundred lines long, whereas the Troy scene – without Lucan's interjection – actually consists of only twenty-nine hexameters.

As Thompson and Bruère point out, the landmarks in lines 970–973 were not chosen at random.⁶ All the mythical Trojan figures have portentous associations. Hesione, who had been exposed to a sea-monster, in Hellas gave birth to Teucer, half-brother of Ajax, and later both of them played great roles in the war against Troy; moreover, the story of Hesione is connected with the perjury of Laomedon, which was the main cause of the wrath of Apollo and Poseidon against Troy. Zeus struck Anchises with his thunderbolt because of the secret affair between him and Aphrodite, and he has only one other important role in the epic tradition: he appears when Aeneas brings him out of the burning city at the time of Troy's destruction. The judge sitting in the cave is Paris, and his judgment was the main cause of the outbreak of the Trojan War, while the rape of Ganymedes is one cause of Iuno's hatred of Troy and the Trojan royal family. Finally, Lucan mentions Oenone, whose grief is also connected with the outbreak of the Trojan War, as Paris left her behind to sail to Hellas and kidnap Helen. Thus none of these landmarks have positive connotations; all of them are connected with tragic stories, or with people and events affecting the history of Troy negatively. This enhances the presence of tragedy and death in the Troy scene, and strengthens the connection between Lucan's Troy and Aeneas' *katabasis* to the Underworld.

Moreover, the end of this section, the phrase *nullum est sine nomine saxum* (LUC. 9, 973) shows us a definite textual parallelism with Anchises' speech to Aeneas in the Underworld, in which he speaks about places which will be populated: *haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine*

⁶ THOMPSON — BRUÈRE (1968: 18).

terrae (VERG. *Aen.* 6, 676). Frederick Ahl argues that at this point in the *Pharsalia* Lucan intentionally recalls the speech of Anchises. Aeneas' father talks about regions where wonderful cities will be raised, but these will become the same kind of ghost cities as the Troy that Caesar visits. In the ruins, pieces of the altar of Zeus Herceius lie scattered, and the ruins of the formerly great altar may symbolize Troy – formerly great, but now ruined. According to Ahl, by mentioning the altar of Zeus Herceius Lucan wants to call to the reader's mind Book 8 of *Aeneid*, where Evander speaks about another great altar, that of Carmentis in Rome. If the ruined altar of Zeus Herceius symbolizes the fate of Troy, Lucan, with this intentional allusion to the speech of Anchises, and by recalling the altar of Carmentis, wants to predict the destruction of Rome, the start of which is the Civil War itself.⁷

At one point in the *Pharsalia* Lucan explicitly states that the destruction of Italy and the fall of Rome is a real threat. In Book 7 he interrupts the narrative with a five-line prophecy, and says that the *Latinum nomen* will be only a myth, Italy will be deserted and will not resemble the former towns (LUCAN. 7, 391–395). The historical analogy of this poetical warning is demonstrated by the description of the ruined Troy.⁸ The expression *memorable nomen* in the first line of the Troy scene recalls *nomen fabula erit* (LUCAN. 7, 392) from that section of Book 7. The word *nomen* sometimes can be interpreted as a mere name without substance,⁹ and this is perfectly true on this occasion, because in Lucan's Troy the Phrygian guide shows Caesar things and places which are not there. The parallelism between these scenes in Book 7 and Book 9 is certainly intentional, as is proved at two more points. The statement in lines 392–393 that dust-covered buildings will not show the appearance of the long-ruined cities, shows parallelism on the level of motifs with Lucan's whole Troy, and on the textual level with lines 977–978 in the Troy scene.¹⁰

Among the pieces of evidence suggesting the connection between Rome and Troy there is another that is worth examining. At one point during Caesar's walk in the city he crosses the river Xanthus; once broad and powerful, in Caesar's time it is small and dry (LUCAN. 9, 974–975). The river had become just as insignificant as the ruined city of Troy. The symbolic start of the Ro-

⁷ The paragraph is based on Ahl's theory: AHL (1976: 218).

⁸ This connection is also mentioned by Ahl, but he places the emphasis on the word *fabula* in line 391 and the Latin League, AHL (1976: 216–218).

⁹ AHL (1976: 218).

¹⁰ *Gabios Veiosque Coramque / pulvere vix tectae poterunt monstrare ruinae.* (LUCAN. 7, 392–393); and *discussa iacebant / saxa nec ullius faciem servantia sacri* (LUCAN. 9, 977–978)

man Civil War was the famous crossing of the river Rubicon, which is as alive, as the city of Rome, but Caesar's crossing another river, the dried-up Xanthus in ruined Troy, may augur the same destiny for Rome. The theory that Lucan implicitly refers to the Rubicon here is strengthened by another episode in the *Pharsalia* that suggests the same. In Book 4 the war in Hispania is interrupted by a temporary peace, when soldiers of the two armies, observing each other's camps, recognize some of their enemy's faces (LUCAN. 4, 157–188). After slowly crossing the rampart, they greet their friends and relatives with affection. According to the original interpretation of the scene, the soldiers start to cross the rampart and to greet each other all together, but in my opinion there was only one single soldier who dared to make a move, and his individual action made the rest of the soldiers follow suit.¹¹ In this way, the scene in Book 4 is a small reflection of the whole epic, as in both occasions there are inactive Roman soldiers, who start moving toward each other because of the action of a single person. However, while Caesar started a bloody civil war with his action, this nameless Roman soldier brought about a temporary peace. The parallel is confirmed by the symbolic action of crossing: the soldier crossed the rampart to make peace between the two armies, while one of the most important moments of the war's outbreak was the crossing of the border marked by the Rubicon.

In Troy, when Caesar sees the scattered pieces of the altar of Zeus Herceius, his Phrygian guide tells him what the stones actually are, and here Lucan names him *monstrator* (LUCAN. 9, 977–979). In the poet's narrative we find no account of the guide's meeting Caesar, and in my opinion that must mean that he escorts Caesar throughout his whole tour of Troy; Lucan refers to the guide only on those occasions when he says something very important. Shadi Bartsch¹² argues that the aforementioned places are shown to Caesar by the guide, and that he mentions the names of ancient Trojan heroes who have connections with these places. Thus the Phrygian's primary function in the scene is to guide Caesar in the ruined city and to give him information about this place. Thus his primary function is essentially the same as the Sibyl's in the *katabasis*. This is not only a parallel of motifs, but also a connection between the nature of the Underworld and that of ruined Troy, because in both places the epic hero needs a guide who can help him understand what

¹¹ Thus in my opinion the word *miles* in line 176 (*mox, ut stimulis maioribus ardens / rupit amor leges, audet transcendere vallum / miles, in amplexus effusas tendere palmas* – LUCAN. 4, 174–176) is not only grammatically singular form, but also singular in meaning: *one soldier*.

¹² BARTSCH (1997: 131–134).

he sees and who can show him the true nature of these places.¹³ In the Troy scene the guide is mentioned twice by Lucan; at Zeus Herceius' altar he warns Caesar that he is stepping on the *manes Hectoreos* (LUCAN. 9, 976–977). In the *katabasis* there is a source for this moment also, when before arriving at Charon's boat the Sibyl warns the frightened Aeneas, who tries to attack the souls around him with his sword. The parallel is obvious: the Phrygian and the Sibyl both prevent the heroes from hurting the dead.

Now let us examine the guide's secondary function. In his paper Tesoriero¹⁴ disagrees with the opinion of Rossi and Ormand.¹⁵ They say that Caesar is a conscious "reader" of what he sees, he can identify the Trojan places, but in Tesoriero's interpretation Caesar does not know what is in front of him, and only the narrator informs us that Caesar is at Hesione's rock or at Paris's cave and so on. I think that Tesoriero's opinion is incorrect, as Caesar does realise the true importance of those places, even if this realization is not based on his own knowledge but on the information given by the *monstrator*. In this way the guide shows Troy to Caesar as Lucan shows it to the reader.¹⁶ So the guide's secondary function, besides simple guiding, is the *sacer labor vatium* (LUCAN. 9, 980) that Lucan mentions immediately after the second appearance of the guide in the seven-line interjection, in which he talks about the function of the poets and declares his own role. This interjection means a turn in Caesar's attitude and behaviour. The hero, who was ignorant of the Trojan past and previously walked around in the city like a mere tourist,¹⁷ suddenly catches the real meaning of the surrounding ruins and respectfully offers a sacrifice to the gods. He does that because the *monstrator* has given him information about the previously meaningless ruins, and showed him how and why he should respect this place. He therefore does what Lucan says is the role of poets: he does not let the past fall into oblivion.

The expression *venturi me teque legent* in line 985 of the interjection will have an important role in my conclusion, so it is crucial to understand these words correctly. A few scholars interpret them as a reference to lit-

¹³ That has been emphasized a few times about Lucan's Troy, for example: BARTSCH (1997: 133).

¹⁴ TESORIERO (2005: 208).

¹⁵ ROSSI (2001: 313–326) and ORMAND (1994: 50–55).

¹⁶ However, Green's statement that "the Phrygian native can only be Lucan himself" GREEN (1991: 252) looks too definite.

¹⁷ Viansino in his commentary connects Caesar in the Troy scene with the aforementioned Alexander in Troy using this aspect of their visits: the verb *circumit* in the first line of Lucan's description corresponds with Plutarch's περιπύεναί, written a few decades later (PLUT. *Alex.* 15), so that both texts represent them as tourists wandering in the city, VIANSINO (1995: 898).

erary works.¹⁸ Haffter has advanced the theory that the *Pharsalia* has to be read as Lucan's answer to Caesar's *Commentarii de bello civili*,¹⁹ and Nagyillés,²⁰ following this theory, says that the expression *Pharsalia nostra* (LUCAN. 9, 985) refers at the same time to the works of both authors on the Civil War. We cannot reject these explanations completely, but in my opinion the interpretation of Housman, Zwierlein and Ahl, which will be discussed later, fits more aptly into the context. Ciechanowicz argues that the vocative *Caesar* does not address the epic hero, but the actual emperor Nero, and the expression *me teque legent* refers to the great epic works of both of them: the *Pharsalia* and the *Troica*.²¹ This interesting explanation raises a significant problem, as it would be complicated to explain *Pharsalia nostra* if we interpreted Lucan's interjection this way. Though we can read *nostra* as a poetic plural with singular meaning, there remains one hardly solvable question: why does Lucan talk about only his own work even after saying that posterity will read the works of both of them? Postgate's explanation also seems unacceptable, as he goes too far in his interpretation and explains *Pharsalia nostra vivet* as "the memory of *Pharsalia* in which you and I, Caesar, have a share, shall never die".²² In Ahl's opinion Postgate's explanation is a "manipulation" of the text, and the expression "our *Pharsalia* shall live" can be perfectly interpreted.²³

The most plausible solution of this problem is given by Housman,²⁴ and accepted by, among others, Zwierlein²⁵ and Ahl²⁶: Lucan's interjection is addressed to Caesar, and the expression *me teque legent* means that poster-

18 For example: MASTERS (1992: 17–18). *Masters* argues that among others this is suggested by the word *inscius* in line 974. This is the attribute of Caesar crossing the dried-up Xanthus. *Masters* thinks that the word *inscius* is a reference to Caesar's *De bello civili*, from which the author omitted the symbolic beginning of the war – the crossing of the border marked by the Rubicon – and in this manner Lucan drew a parallel between the two rivers.

19 HAFFTER (1957: 118–126).

20 NAGYILLÉS (2009: 327).

21 CIECHANOWICZ (1982: 265–275).

22 POSTGATE (1917: XC).

23 "There is no problem with the Latin; there is only a problem in Postgate's unwillingness to accept Lucan's meaning as reasonable." AHL (1976: 328–329).

24 HOUSMAN (1926: 296).

25 ZWIERLEIN (1986: 477). *Zwierlein* interprets these two lines as a sarcastic promise, and this is supported by Lucan's whole Troy scene as we can find a few definite references to Rome's forthcoming destruction. As the causes of it are Caesar's actions it cannot be a real appreciative promise.

26 AHL (1976: 327–330).

ity will read Lucan's epic and, together with that, will read about Caesar's deeds.²⁷ As Housman says: (*legent proelium a te gestum, a me scriptum*).²⁸ The idea of connecting the author of a historical work with the historical protagonist of his work is not a novelty; we can observe that, for example, in the *praefatio* of Sallust's *De Coniuratione Catilinae*. At textual level the expression evokes the last poem of Ovid's *Tristia*, the line *dumque legar, mecum pariter tua fama legetur* (OV. *Tr.* 5, 14, 5) also indicates that the author, the work and the subject are indivisible. On these grounds I think that *Pharsalia nostra* means nothing other than the deeds of Caesar which Lucan gave to eternity with his epic.

After the interjection (LUCAN. 9, 980–986) we return to Troy. The ends of the two scenes, the sections before departure, show parallelism as well. Before Aeneas leaves the Underworld Anchises makes him a momentous prophecy about the greatness of Rome and the future of the empire that Aeneas will found. Before Caesar leaves Troy he offers a sacrifice in the ancient home of the Roman gods, and at the end of his speech makes a brief prophecy. This is the most important part of Caesar's speech, when he makes a promise to the gods that he will rebuild Troy. Some scholars say that this intention of Caesar's is not mere fantasy on Lucan's part, but has a historical foundation. This is based on the seventy–ninth chapter of

²⁷ This idea appears elsewhere in Roman literature. From the golden age, Lucan's words recall Horace, who in his Odes presages his immortality through his poetry (*non omnis moriar multaue pars mei / vitabit Libitinam* – Hor. *Carm.* 3, 30, 6–7); he also proclaims the eternity of his work in the first lines of this ode (*Exegi monumentum... / quod non... / possit diruere aut innumerabilis / annorum series et fuga temporum* – Hor. *Carm.* 3, 30, 1–5). Lucan with his words *venturi me legent* emphasizes the permanency of both author and work, as they will live on together. This is indicated by the use of the personal pronoun *me* instead of a possessive pronoun. We can also find this kind of poetical enunciation in epic poetry preceding Lucan: in the last nine lines of his *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 15, 871–879) Ovid expresses the same idea. These lines on the one hand call to the reader's mind Horace's Ode 3, 30 (*Iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis / nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas* – OV. *Met.* 15, 871–872), and on the other hand precede Lucan's poetical self–consciousness (*ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama, / siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam* – 15, 878–879). If we try to find the first appearance of this thought in the Roman epic tradition, we have to go back to Ennius, who also has a passage with the same kind of poetical pronouncement (*Nam latos populos res atque poemata nostra / chuebant* – *Ann.* 1, 3 V, 12 Sk). Moreover, in Ennius' fragment – as in Lucan's words – not only the eternity of the work appears, but the immortality of the topic as well.

²⁸ In my opinion *Ahl's* slight modification of this paraphrase is correct, AHL (1976: 329–330), as there is no cause to think that Lucan only had the Battle of Pharsalus in his mind when he wrote these words, since Statius, for example, in his *Silvae* designates the whole war as *Pharsalica bella* (2, 7, 66). So the most accurate interpretation of this expression is: *bellum a te gestum, a me scriptum*.

Suetonius' *Life of Caesar*, where the author writes that it was rumoured that Caesar wanted to move all of his worldly goods to Troy, and with that Troy would have become de facto the capital city, leaving Rome and the Senate without real power.²⁹

So, the end of Caesar's speech is a grandiose promise: *Romana Pergama surgent* (LUCAN. 9, 999). Lucan makes a connection between the two scenes. The only place in the *Aeneid* where Virgil refers to Caesar is a line from the prophetic speech of Anchises,³⁰ and Lucan seemingly gives an answer to Virgil, as the only place where Aeneas' name occurs in the *Pharsalia* is Caesar's speech in Troy (LUCAN. 9, 991). In my opinion this cannot be unintentional, but Lucan deliberately highlights the connection between Anchises' prophecy and Caesar's speech in this way.

Among the parallelisms detected between the Troy scene and the *katabasis* of the *Aeneid*, this is the only one in which we can find a significant difference on the level of content. When Aeneas met Anchises in the Underworld he had only the potential to found a worldwide empire, so he received a prophecy from the supernatural world, while Caesar, with great power over Rome, makes a prophetic promise to the transcendent world, but, as a mortal, his is not to be fulfilled. In this manner, by a kind of contrasting imitation, Lucan shows us simultaneously the character of Aeneas, who listens to the destiny of the future Rome in the Underworld and in Italy with Evander, and the character of Caesar, who gazes at the beginnings of the glorious history of the city that is now destined to perish.

Moreover, I'd like to point out one more thing. In my opinion there is a special Lucanian humour and irony in this episode that also refutes the theory that the seven-line interjection does not fit together with the rest of the Troy scene.³¹ With the end of Caesar's speech, the actions of poet and imperator converge. Lucan, in his interjection, first respectfully commemo-

²⁹ Most scholars state that it is unimaginable that Caesar actually purposed this, but as *Ahl* says "given Caesar's preoccupation with connecting his ancestry with Aeneas and Troy, such a rumour probably seemed all too credible at the time." AHL (1976: 109).

³⁰ ...*aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci / descendens, gener adversis instructus Eois!* (Verg. *Aen.* 6, 830–831).

³¹ *Hermann* believes that the original place of this interjection is not the Troy scene, but in the proem of the epic, and accordingly the vocative *Caesar* addresses Nero, HERMANN (1970: 283–287). This theory was not widely accepted, and in my opinion the arguments in my paper also confirm that the original place of this passage is the Troy scene of Book 9. Moreover, it is necessary to quote *Rossi* here, who says about this interjection that "Troy indeed seems the most suitable place for such an important confrontation between Caesar and the poet. At Troy, Caesar's 'past' and the epic poet's past converge", ROSSI (2001: 321). *Rossi* also cites *Masters'* aforementioned notion (see note 3), which also proves that this passage is in its original place.

rates his great predecessor, Homer, and then makes a prophetic vow to his epic hero, in which he declares that his work will be eternal. Caesar first respectfully offers a sacrifice to the Roman gods in their ancient home, and then makes a prophetic vow to rebuild Troy. The salute to the revered past and the prophetic promise of great deeds are combined in their actions, but ironically the last part of Caesar's promise became fulfilled not by himself but by the poet, who wrote an epic about him: in Book 9 of the *Pharsalia* Lucan actually rebuilt Troy: he built a new, Roman Troy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHL, FREDERICK M. 1976. *Lucan, an Introduction*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- BARTSCH, SHADI. 1997. *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- CIECHANOWICZ, JERZY. 1982. „Das Problem der Apostrophe IX 980–986 in der *Pharsalia* von Marcus Annaeus Lucanus.” *Eos* 70, 265–275.
- GREEN, C. M. C. 1991. „Stimulos dedit aemula virtus: Lucan and Homer reconsidered.” *Phoenix*, 45, 230–254
- HAFFTER, HEINZ. 1957. „Dem schwanken Zünglein lauschend wachte Caesar dort.” *Museum Helveticum*, 14, 118–126.
- HERMANN, LÉON. 1970. „Der Prolog der *Pharsalia*.” In RUTZ, WERNER [ED.]. 1970. *Lucan*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 283–287.
- HOUSMAN, ALFRED EDWARD [ED.]. 1926. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civili Libri Decem*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- MASTERS, JAMIE. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NAGYILLÉS JÁNOS. 2009. „A szónok költő és az istenapparátus.” *Antik Tanulmányok*, 53, 219–237.
- ORMAND, KIRK. 1994. „Lucan's „Auctor Vix Fidelis”.” *Classical Antiquity*, 13, 38–55.
- POSTGATE, JOHN PERCIVAL [ED.]. 1917. *M. Annaei Lucani Liber VII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ROSNER–SIEGEL, JUDITH A. 1983. „The Oak and the Lightning.” *Athenaeum n.s.*, 61, 165–177
- ROSSI, ANDREOLA. 2001. „Remapping the Past: Caesar's Tale of Troy (Lucan „BC” 9.964–999).” *Phoenix*, 55, 313–326.
- TESORIERO, CHARLES. 2005. „Trampling over Troy: Caesar, Virgil, Lucan.” In WALDE, CHRISTINE [ED.]. *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*. München: K. G. Saur, 2005, 202–215.
- THOMPSON, LYNETTE — BRUÈRE, RICHARD T. 1968. “Lucan's Use of Virgilian Reminiscence.” *Classical Philology*, 1–21.
- VIANSINO, GIOVANNI [ED.]. 1995. *Marco Annaeo Lucano La Guerra Civile (Farsaglia) II*. Milano: Mondadori.
- WICK, CLAUDIA. 2004. *Bellum civile, Liber IX*. München–Leipzig: K. G. Saur.
- ZWIERLEIN, OTTO. 1986. “Lucans Caesar in Troja.” *Hermes*, 114, 460–478.