LUND
UNIVERSITY

CATO AND *LIBERTAS* IN LUCAN'S *BELLUM CIVILE*

Eamon Hanley

Supervisor: Docent Cajsa Sjöberg

Centre for Language and Literature, Lund University

MA in Language and Linguistics

Specialization: Latin

SPVR02 Language and Linguistics: Degree Project—Master's (One Year) Thesis

May, 2021

Abstract

In the 60s CE, a young Roman named Lucan composed an epic poem about a civil war fought between Caesar and Pompey, an event that signaled the end of the Roman Republic. Aside from Caesar and Pompey, the poem draws attention to another major figure in Roman politics at the time, Cato the Younger; of particular note is the frequent occurrence of the word *libertas* (freedom) in the poem. This thesis focuses mainly on the particular interrelationship between Cato and *libertas* by analyzing a series of speeches made by Cato where he mentions the word in question; it will also focus on how other characters in the poem view *libertas* by analyzing speeches made by them to establish whether or not their views on *libertas* differ from that of Cato, as well as on how the author himself can have interpreted it.

Keywords: *libertas*, Cato, Caesar, Pompey, Pharsalus, *Bellum Civile*, Republic, Principate

libertas sine Catone? non magis quam Cato sine libertate
(Valerius Maximus, 6.2.5)

quid tibi vis, Marce Cato? iam non agitur de libertate: olim pessumdata est
(Seneca, Epistulae Morales 14.13)

ex innocentia nascitur dignitas, ex dignitate honor, ex honore imperium, ex imperio libertas
(Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus Minor)

neque enim Cato post libertatem vixit nec libertas post Catonem
(Seneca, De constantia sapientis 2.2)

1. Introduction

Anyone who happened to be living in Rome in the 40s BCE cannot have failed to sense that an upheaval of massive proportions was in the works. Two generals, Gaius Iulius Caesar and Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus, were engaged in war against one another in a bid to achieve domination over the Roman Empire. Pompey had the backing of the Senate, yet that was not enough to prevail over Caesar, who enjoyed the support of the plebs (common people). Pompey and Caesar—the former at one point being the latter's son-in-law—had as early as 60 BCE established a compact known as the First Triumvirate together with Marcus Licinius Crassus; this came to an end following the death of Crassus in 53, after which the other two turned on each other, their actions eventually resulting in a civil war which culminated in the Battle of Pharsalus in 48. Caesar's forces won the day, and Pompey fled to Egypt, where death awaited him.

Rome found itself in a state of transition as a result of this war. The Republic, instated as early as 509 BCE, slowly but surely gave way to a Principate beginning with Augustus. Although rule over the State was now bestowed upon one person only, Augustus did not seek to do away with all the Republican elements—the Senate and the *cursus honorum* system were retained, though the former powers vested in them had become significantly reduced. One particular tenet strongly associated with the Republic was the concept of *libertas*, a word with many a vicissitude bestowed thereupon; though the core meaning thereof is "freedom", it entails so much more than that.

In the 60s CE, a young Roman named Marcus Annaeus Lucanus was writing *De Bello Civili*, alternately known as *Bellum Civile* or *Pharsalia*, an epic poem about the civil war published in 10 books. It is widely held to be incomplete[1] (it ends rather abruptly in Book 10 in the midst of an account of the Battle of Alexandria), for Lucan was forced to commit suicide due to his involvement in the Pisonian conspiracy which sought to overthrow Emperor Nero in 65 CE, and there is no general consensus on how many books had been intended, nor on how much of the war Lucan intended to cover. Aside from Pompey and Caesar, it also focuses on a person who played a significant role in Roman politics at that time: Marcus Porcius Cato, commonly referred to as Cato the Younger or Cato Uticensis to avoid confusion with his namesake great-grandfather (consul 195 BCE).

[1]Haffter (1957) and Masters (1992), among others, contest this view, arguing that the poem as we have it is complete.

1.1 Purpose and method

This thesis will focus on the topics of Cato and *libertas* as portrayed in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, as well as the interrelationship between the two. To do this, I shall investigate and analyze a series of speeches occurring throughout the poem that mention not just *libertas* but also the cognate adjective *liber*, to provide a fuller overview of the use of the term "free(dom)". I have also prepared a set of research questions to go with the general discussion:

1) Which particular shade of *libertas* is meant in a given context?
2) What can be inferred from Cato's view on *libertas* as appears in the poem?
3) What can be inferred from how the author himself broaches the subject?

The speeches in question are made not only by Cato but by other characters as well, and by using the compare/contrast approach I aim to show whether or not the word *libertas* differs in meaning in the mouths of each character. At the same time, we could also ask ourselves what is going on in the speakers' minds: What is their take on freedom, and what significance does it have to them? Furthermore, what can we as readers garner from their personalities in general? As mentioned earlier, *libertas* has multiple shades of meaning, rendering it a rather complex subject.

As regards Lucanian scholarship focusing on the interrelationship between Cato and *libertas*, most of the literature I have consulted addressing the topic has merely scratched the surface, so a deeper reflection on the link in question is therefore in order. My main aim here is to get to the bottom of the issue by investigating how Cato relates to (the various facets of) *libertas* within the framework of Lucan's poem. The only problem here is that the historical Cato's opinions regarding *libertas* have not been preserved, thereby rendering comparisons virtually impossible.

1.2 Lucan and Cato

Lucan was the nephew of the renowned philosopher Seneca the Younger, who was advisor to Nero. Thanks to this connection, Lucan gained admittance to the Imperial court. The relationship between poet and emperor was cordial at first, yet it did not last long. Nero, who had poetic aspirations of his own, seemed to resent Lucan's success, and consequently barred him from reciting and publishing his works. Lucan became embittered as a result, exhibiting a pro-Republican sentiment clearly discerned in Books 7-10, where he relishes in frequently lambasting Caesar, though he is more lenient towards Pompey. Cato, on the other hand, who occurs in only two of the books (2 and 9), garners the most praise from Lucan.

Who exactly was this Cato whom Lucan appraises so highly in his poem? Muriel Jaeger provides the following portraiture of him:

> He is a disconcerting youth with steady, grave, innocent eyes who regards with a puzzled surprise many of our quite harmless little ways. For his own part, his habits are above reproach. He dresses plainly and without pandering to climatic vagaries. He is abstemious at his meals and disdains the sociable minor vices. He wears no hat in sun or rain; he will habitually refuse a lift, preferring to go on foot. He distresses his relatives by appearing at social functions, if at all, in a costume suitable to a camping holiday. If an honour is awarded to him which he feels he has not fairly earned, he will embarrass the donors by refusing it. If a friend asks him to use his 'pull' to obtain him a job or an advantage, the reply will probably involve the end of the friendship. If he comes into the independent income of which we could ourselves make such excellent use, he celebrates the occasion by reducing his expenditure. He is likely, if he is old enough, to be engaged in some form of public work, and he will always be the first to arrive and the last to go at his office. Like Pompey, when he received a visit from such a young man in Asia, people 'honour him when he is present and are glad when he goes away.'[2]

One of the earliest accounts of Cato's personality can be found in Sallust's *De coniuratione Catilinae* (On the Conspiracy of Catiline), in which the characters of Cato and Caesar are compared/contrasted[3]:

---

[2]Jaeger 1932: 1

[3]LIV.1-6; translation by John C. Rolfe (1921; emphasis mine).

Igitur eis genus, aetas, eloquentia prope aequalia fuere, magnitudo animi par, item gloria, sed alia alii. Caesar beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur, **integritate vitae Cato**. Ille mansuetudine et misericordia clarus factus, **huic severitas dignitatem addiderat**. Caesar dando, sublevando, ignoscundo, **Cato nihil largiundo** gloriam adeptus est. In altero miseris perfugium erat, **in altero malis pernicies**. Illius facilitas, **huius constantia** laudabatur. Postremo Caesar in animum induxerat laborare, vigilare; negotiis amicorum intentus sua neglegere, nihil denegare quod dono dignum esset; sibi magnum imperium, exercitum, bellum novom exoptabat, ubi virtus enitescere posset. **At Catoni studium modestiae, decoris, sed maxume severitatis erat. Non divitiis cum divite neque factione cum factioso, sed cum strenuo virtute, cum modesto pudore, cum innocente abstinentia certabat; esse quam videri bonus malebat; ita quo minus petebat gloriam, eo magis illum sequebatur.**

In birth then, in years and in eloquence, they were about equal; in greatness of soul they were evenly matched, and likewise in renown, although the renown of each was different. Caesar was held great because of his benefactions and lavish generosity, **Cato for the uprightness of his life**. The former became famous for his gentleness and compassion, **the austerity of the latter had brought him prestige**. Caesar gained glory by giving, helping, and forgiving; **Cato by never stooping to bribery**. One was a refuge for the unfortunate, **the other a scourge for the wicked**. The good nature of the one was applauded, **the steadfastness of the other**. Finally, Caesar had schooled himself to work hard and sleep little, to devote himself to the welfare of his friends and neglect his own, to refuse nothing which was worth the giving. He longed for great power, an army, a new war to give scope for his brilliant merit. **Cato, on the contrary, cultivated self-control, propriety, but above all austerity. He did not vie with the rich in riches nor in intrigue with the intriguer, but with the active in good works, with the self-restrained in moderation, with the blameless in integrity. He preferred to be, rather than to seem, virtuous; hence the less he sought fame, the more it pursued him.**

Cato was born in 95 BCE, the son of Marcus Porcius Cato and Livia. He joined his half-brother Caepio in the war against Spartacus in 72 and was appointed military tribune in Macedon in 67. He was elected to the quaestorship in 65, during which he prosecuted former quaestors for illegally appropriating funds; in 63 he served as tribune of the plebs. He figures in Cicero's speech *Pro Murena*, at whose trial Cato was one of the prosecutors. Here Cicero took the opportunity to mock Cato's Stoic beliefs[4]; Cato has reportedly uttered "what a witty consul we have" afterwards.[5] In Sallust's account on the Catilinarian conspiracy, he makes a speech calling on the importance to capitally punish the conspirators in order to set an example.[6] It was also around this time that his protracted conflicts with Caesar and Pompey emerged, which were further exacerbated when the First Triumvirate was established.

In 58 he was ordered by Publius Clodius Pulcher, tribune of the plebs, to annex Cyprus, a province laden with gold which would certainly have enticed others to make a grab for it, yet Cato knew better. He managed to raise the approximate sum of 7,000 silver talents for the Roman treasury[7]; although the money made it to Rome, his accounting books were lost in the process. He was elected praetor in 54, and by then the triumvirate had foundered. He ran for consul in 52 but lost, refusing to run a second time. He persuaded the Senate to rescind Caesar's proconsular command, yet he was not as fortunate

[4]Cicero, *Pro Murena* LX-LXVI
[5]Plutarch, *Cato Minor* XXI.5
[6]Sallust, *De coniuratione Catilinae* LII. Drogula (2019: 73) writes that although "much of this speech may be the work of Sallust's hand, Cato would repeatedly make use of these same rhetorical devices during his career."
[7]Plutarch, *op. cit*. XXXVIII.1

in getting Caesar to return to Rome as a private citizen; Caesar responded by crossing the Rubicon, intent on seizing control. Civil war was now inevitable; Cato was sent to Sicily in order to stem Caesar's advancing forces, retreating to Greece when he found himself outnumbered, though he managed to reduce their numbers at Dyrrhachium. Pompey met up with Caesar at Pharsalus and took to flight upon losing the battle. Cato headed for Libya to resume the struggle thence together with Metellus Scipio, whose forces were defeated by Caesar at Thapsus in February 46. Cato, garrisoned at Utica, committed suicide there two months later.

Unlike Pompey and Caesar, Cato never lusted for power. He was a staunch defender of the Republic and its institutions, and sought to uphold its name and glory in the face of adversity. Such was his influence that his very name, especially during the Principate, became synonymous with the Republic itself. Yet even his legacy had its firm detractors—to those who sought to benefit personally from state interests, he was an outright pain in the neck; furthermore, he was viewed as inimical to the slightest change. Cicero, whose relationship with him could be rocky at times, once wrote to his friend Atticus that "he talks as if he lives in Plato's Republic, not in Romulus' cesspool" (*dicit enim tamquam in Platonis* πολιτείᾳ*, non tamquam in Romuli faece sententiam*).[8] Even Cato's most intimate friends would have had to admit that he was not that easy to get along with, given his strict adherence to principles and reluctance to compromise.

Yet that did not stop Lucan from harboring any semblance of respect towards the man, though openly professing admiration for Cato during Nero's reign was a risky business. At that time, the so-called Stoic Opposition, a small group of senators and intellectuals opposed to the policies of the *princeps*, was in action. This clique, adopting Cato as its paragon, was viewed with especial suspicion by the powers-that-be who regarded them as Republican sympathizers and thus as a threat to the status quo. One of them, Thrasea Paetus, wrote a biography on Cato and was particularly vocal in his opposition towards Nero, a stance that ultimately cost him his life. Like his uncle as well as Cato, Lucan was an adherent of Stoicism, and therefore an easy target; writing about a subject as sensitive as the Civil War would have made his situation even more precarious. By making Cato appear the closest there is to a hero in his epic, Lucan was clearly making a statement; Goodman & Soni (2012) in particular state that he "took praise of Cato to its furthest extreme".[9] Indeed, so awed was he by the man that he made

[8]Cicero, *Epistulae ad Atticum*, II.1.8
[9]Goodman & Soni 2012: 285

his feelings for him known rather explicitly, as the following passage (IX.593-604) indicates[10]:

si ueris magna paratur
fama bonis et si successu nuda remoto
inspicitur uirtus, quidquid laudamus in ullo
maiorum, fortuna fuit. quis Marte secundo,
quis tantum meruit populorum sanguine nomen?
hunc ego per Syrtes Libyaeque extrema triumphum
ducere maluerim, quam ter Capitolia curru
scandere Pompei, quam frangere colla Iugurthae.
ecce parens uerus patriae, dignissimus aris,
Roma, tuis, per quem numquam iurare pudebit
et quem, si steteris umquam ceruice soluta,
nunc, olim, factura deum es.

If great renown is won by true merit, and if virtue is considered in itself and apart from success, then all that we praise in any of our ancestors was Fortune's gift. Who ever gained so great a name by winning battles and shedding the blood of nations? I would choose to lead this triumphant march through the Syrtes and the remotest parts of Libya rather than ascend the Capitol thrice over in Pompey's car, or break Jugurtha's neck. **Behold the true father of his country, a man most worthy to be worshipped by Romans**; to swear by his name will never make men blush; and if they ever, now or later, free their necks from the yoke and stand upright, they will make a god of Cato.

It is crucial not to confuse Lucan's Cato with the historical one, since Lucan had a tendency to portray him as a flawless superman/deity. The real Cato, even though he had more integrity than most of his contemporaries, had also made his fair share of mistakes—one of his greatest was his rejection of Pompey's proposal to marry his daughter Porcia, causing Pompey to turn to Caesar, in the process sowing the seeds for the first Triumvirate which came to trigger a chain of events that eventually brought down the Republic.[11]

Yet one cannot blame Lucan for wanting to mythologize Cato. Lucan saw in him a man who fought for a noble cause yet wound up on the losing side, who remained calm in the face of adversity, and who would not allow himself to be thought of as a loser. Lucan, disgusted as he was by Nero's antics, came to adopt a pro-Republican stance in the course of writing *Bellum Civile*, and in so doing it was only natural that he would champion Cato, who lived and breathed the Republic like no one else. Cato's desert march through Libya (IX.368-949) in particular can be considered a moral triumph eclipsing even Caesar's most grandiose achievements. By upholding Cato the way he did, Lucan was clearly making a stand against the order of his day.

[10]All quotations from *Bellum Civile* follow Housman's (1926) edition, and all translations are by Duff (1928) unless otherwise indicated [emphasis mine].
[11]Plutarch rebukes him on that very point in his Life on Cato (XXX.4).

1.3 *Libertas*

An oft-recurring word in the poem is *libertas*, which also plays a significant role therein. A word with strong Republican connotations especially in Lucan's time, it has been exploited by various factions to suit their own needs to such an extent that it has become quite a sociopolitically charged term.

A closer look at the word *libertas* yields the following observations. According to the Oxford Latin Dictionary[12], it can mean one of several things:

(1) The civil status of a free man, freedom (as opposed to slavery or captivity)
(2) The political status of a sovereign people, freedom, independence
(3) Freedom from physical restraint or obstruction
(4) a. Freedom or opportunity (to do something)
    b. Freedom or release (from an obligation)
(5) a. Freedom to act as one pleases
    b. Unrestricted control (of)
    c. A licence in the use of language
(6) Freedom as a mark of character, independence
(7) Frankness of speech, outspokenness, plain speaking
(8) Excessive freedom in behavior, lack of restraint, licence, impertinence
(9) (personified)

Quotes from various authors are included to illustrate each meaning in context, and among the quotes used to define (5a) we find Lucan (*tum data libertas odiis*; II.145).[13]

Chaim Wirszubski, in his seminal monograph *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*, states that *libertas* "primarily denotes the status of a 'liber', i.e. a person who is not a slave, and comprises both the negation of the limitations imposed by slavery and the assertion of the advantages deriving from freedom."[14] Edwin White Webster writes that it "was the right to stand for and hold the various civic offices and to take part in the deliberations of the comitia

[12]OLD 1968: 1025
[13]Duff (1928: 66) records *tunc* rather than *tum*, and translates the aforementioned sentence as "licence was granted then to private hatred".
[14]Wirszubski 1950: 1

and the senate."[15] Furthermore, Wirszubski claims that *libertas* can be used to designate either *a)* sovereign independence and autonomy, or *b)* a Republican form of government.[16] With the emergence of the Principate, *libertas* pretty much came to designate the latter, especially as the *princeps*, in particular Nero, came to adopt a more tyrannical stance.

L.R. Lind, writing about *libertas* and its association with *auctoritas*, within the context of the Republic, observes that "[*l*]*ibertas* therefore theoretically represented or was the result of a number of political phenomena: the fairness, justice, and equity of the laws, especially the voting laws; the total sum of civic rights granted to the individual by these laws, representing the Roman constitution; freedom from *regnum* and its servitude; freedom to choose an *auctor* and to profit from his *auctoritas*; liberty was even virtually equivalent to *concordia*."[17]

In her study on how *libertas* was viewed following the inauguration of the Principate, Nicola Mackie states that "[*l*]*ibertas* after Actium was not merely the freedom of the populace from senatorial oppression, or of Rome from dictatorship, or of Rome and Italy from Triumviral control. It was the freedom of everyone, including Octavian himself, from Egyptian rule; and in so far as *libertas* was now equated with Rome's survival as an independent State, it was also more closely identified with the rule of law that guaranteed everyone's freedom than with the individual freedoms that laws restrained. This positive interpretation of *libertas* is later found in association with the idea of *securitas*. Positive interpretation of *libertas* neutralised the concept's politically disruptive tendencies. The new *libertas* could also accommodate a *Princeps*."[18]

There were two major political factions in Republican Rome: the *optimates* (who were more conservative and constituted the aristocratic order) and the *populares* (who were more liberal). They did not see eye to eye on what constituted *libertas*; the latter in particular "based their view of liberty upon the tribunate of the people, the privilege of *provocatio* (appeal to the people against a magistrate's decision), and the various rights of Roman citizenship. One of the most important events in the people's progress toward a more equal share in the government was the agrarian revolution

[15]Webster 1936: 7
[16]Wirszubski 1950: 4-5
[17]Lind 1986: 87
[18]Mackie 1986: 326

attempted by the Gracchi, which Sallust described as the emancipation of the Roman plebs."[19]

1.3.1 Previous scholarship on *libertas* in the *Bellum Civile*

Amongst those who have written about *libertas* we find Hans Kloesel (1935), Webster (1936), Wirszubski (1950), Jochen Bleicken (1972), Wolfgang Dieter Lebek (1976), Robert A. Tucker (1977), Lind (1986), Mackie (1986), Peter Astbury Brunt (1988), Valentina Arena (2012), and Nadja Kimmerle (2015). Wirszubski's tome remains an authority on the topic to this day. Brunt and Arena, while offering insightful glimpses into the bare essentials of *libertas*, focus mainly on the Republican period; Wirszubski's treatment, on the other hand, spans as far as the reign of Trajan (98-117 CE), thereby providing a far more comprehensive overview of how *libertas* has been viewed and appropriated. Tucker's article "Lucan and *Libertas*" offers a neat encapsulation of the many nuances of the word. Lind's treatment of *libertas* is brief yet informative. Kimmerle, in her dissertation *Lucan und der Prinzipat*, provides a thorough analysis on the various shades of *libertas*, with emphasis on the issues of inconsistency and unreliable narrative; unlike Tucker, who focuses solely on the noun *libertas*, Kimmerle has the cognate adjective *liber* included in her discussion.

Among those who have addressed the interrelationship between Cato and *libertas* are Andrew W. Lintott (1971), Frederick M. Ahl (1974, 1976, 1993), Charles Martindale (1984), Robert J. Goar (1987), David B. George (1991), Alain M. Gowing (2005), Tim Stover (2008), and Erica M. Bexley (2009). Stover in particular seems to regard this particular relationship as something unitary and intimate, not to mention interdependent—none can function without the other, so to speak (Cato is reliant on *libertas* to further his agenda; conversely, *libertas* calls on Cato to do her bidding).

Furthermore, Herbert C. Nutting (1932), in his article "The Hero of the Pharsalia", singles out *libertas* as its hero, in contrast to those who bestow that epithet upon Cato. Nutting's argument bears mention: "Lacking a fully developed hero for the Pharsalia, would it be too fanciful to suggest the claims of a heroine, namely *Libertas*? Certainly she plays an outstanding part through the whole tragedy. At first she is exploited by rival partisans who use her name as a cloak for their selfish designs. After Pharsalus, she withdraws in despair beyond Roman boundaries, to an exile made permanent by

[19]Lind 1986: 86

Caesar's final victory and the establishment of an imperial house."[20]

1.3.2 *Libertas* according to Lebek (1976) and Kimmerle (2015)

Lebek and Kimmerle make use of both noun and adjective in their respective discussions, yet, whereas Kimmerle covers all instances displayed in *Bellum Civile*, Lebek focuses mainly on Books 1, 2, 3, and 7. Lebek felt compelled to address the topic of *libertas* in a more elaborate fashion since he considered previous material on the subject to be relatively scant and thus of little use.[21] In his chapter on *libertas* (1976: 167-209) he summarizes the use thereof as follows:

(1) Political freedom (e.g. the first instance of the word in the poem [1.172]);
(2) As a reference to the temporal experience area of the characters (furthermore, he states that Lucan never made it obvious that any of the citations as used by Lebek would have merited any validity in his own time[22]);
(3) Freedom that is no longer politically practicable, especially as the Republic was nearing its end.

Lebek also asserts that *libertas* is used in a more apolitical sense in the first three books, only to assume a decidedly politically charged Republican veneer starting with the seventh, especially regarding the aftermath of Pharsalus. Kimmerle, on the other hand, disagrees with him on that point.[23]

Kimmerle's tack differs considerably from Lebek's, in that she opts to read *libertas* as something inherently inconsistent and hence subject to unreliability. She opines that the narrator (whether Lucan or a neutral character) offers contrasting takes on the word in question on both political and philosophical grounds, and so do more or less the characters who utter it. She urges the potential reader to be cautious of not taking the opinions of any of the characters in *Bellum Civile* at face value; to her, the contradictions themselves are proof positive that the narrative cannot stand on its own merits. Furthermore, she asserts that the narrator's views cannot be interpreted as the author's own thoughts, but rather as a literary strategy where the meaningfulness itself is called into question.[24]

[20]Nutting 1932: 43
[21]Lebek 1976: 167 n.1
[22]ibid. 207
[23]Kimmerle 2015: 170
[24]ibid. 211

1.4 The Civil War *in nuce*

The Civil War begins traditionally with Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon (January 10, 49 BCE). Pompey and the majority of the Senate sought refuge in Greece the following month. In March, Caesar turned westwards, besieging Massilia and defeating the Pompeians Lucius Afranius and Marcus Petreius in Ilerda, Hispania.

The following year, Caesar headed for the east, meeting up with Pompey first at the Battle of Dyrrhachium (July 10), which he lost, then at the Battle of Pharsalus (August 9), which he won. Pompey headed for Egypt, hoping that the Pharaoh, Ptolemy XIII, would lend him aid; instead he was murdered before even reaching the shore, the day before his 58th birthday. His head was removed and delivered to Caesar, who arrived in Egypt a while later, sided with Cleopatra, and engaged in battle with Ptolemy, who was deposed and later killed in the Battle of the Nile the following year.

In 47, Caesar made for Pontus, defeating king Pharnaces II at the Battle of Zela in May. Later on, he headed for Africa to take on Metellus Scipio and Labienus, his former lieutenant in Gaul. The Battle of Ruspina (January 4, 46) saw Caesar's forces reduced to two-thirds. On February 6, Scipio and Juba, king of the Numidians in Libya, were defeated by Caesar at the Battle of Thapsus. In November, Caesar headed back to Hispania, culminating in a decisive victory at the Battle of Munda (March 17, 45), claiming the lives of Gnaeus Pompeius and Labienus. This marked the end of the Civil War.

Cato's role in the war was fairly minimal. He saw action in Dyrrhachium, where he commanded the port, and apart from heading for Africa and continuing resistance from Utica, very little else is known aside from what Plutarch recounts in his biography on him (LVI-LXXIII).

2. The use of speeches in Lucan

Bellum Civile tends to be considered more a work of rhetoric than of poetry. Quintilian mentions Lucan in his *Institutio Oratoria* (X.1.90) and famously opines: *Lucanus ardens et concitatus et sententiis clarissimus et, ut dicam quod sentio, magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus* ("Lucan is fiery and passionate and remarkable for the grandeur of his general reflexions, but, to be frank, I consider that he is more suitable for imitation by the orator than by the poet").[25] Lucan, like his uncle Seneca the Younger, excelled in a rhetorical device known as the *sententia*, the equivalent of today's slogan, his most celebrated one being *uictrix causa deis placuit sed uicta Catoni* ("if the victor had the gods on his side, the vanquished had Cato"; I.128).

Lucan was said to have been a bright student (so much so that he eventually earned the envy of Nero). Judging by one of his contemporaries, the poet Persius—whom Lucan greatly admired—, Cato was a common topic at school. Persius states in his third Satire that the subject of Cato, especially his dying words, had become so tedious to the point where he could make light thereof: *saepe oculos, memini, tangebam parvus olivo, / grandia si nollem morituri verba Catonis / discere, non sano multum laudanda magistro, / quae pater adductis sudans audiret amicis* ("often, I remember, as a small boy I used to give my eyes a touch with oil, if I did not want to learn Cato's grand dying speech, sure to be vehemently applauded by my wrong-headed master, that my father might hear me recite in a glow of perspiring ecstacy with a party of friends for the occasion"; III.44-47).[26] Quintilian brings up in the third book of his aforementioned œuvre the question whether Cato should marry (3.5.8-15), a topic whereof Lucan himself made use.

Students attending rhetorical schools in Lucan's time were asked to compose *suasoriae*, speeches that serve to advise historical figures on a course of action. Lucan may even have had access to his paternal grandfather Seneca the Elder's book of *suasoriae*, which, together with a set of books called *Controversiae*, was written ostensibly at the request of Seneca's sons. Stanley F. Bonner, writing about Lucan's position vis-à-vis the declamation schools, argues, not without plausibility, that some of Lucan's *suasoriae* might have been developed already at school:

[25]Translation by Butler 1920-22.
[26]Translation by Conington 1872.

> The *suasoria*, if fully developed, represented the arguments both for and against a proposed course of action. When, therefore, we find in Lucan speeches grouped in pairs, presenting the arguments for and against a particular decision, we may be sure that this reflects the general treatment of the *suasoria* in the schools. There are several such paired speeches: for instance, Brutus to Cato and Cato to Brutus in II, 242 ff. and 286 ff. on the question of Cato's participation in the Civil War; and Pompey to Cornelia and Cornelia to Pompey in V, 739 ff. and 762 ff., on the question whether she should be sent to Lesbos for safety. In such speeches, a close examination often shows that the arguments of the speakers are neatly balanced. Sometimes, even the phraseology of the one is picked up by the phraseology of the other; a simile used by one is balanced by a corresponding simile of the other; a final point on one side is met by a final countering point on the other. For example, in reply to Brutus' charge: "facient te bella nocentem" (II, 259), Cato retorts: "crimen erit superis et me fecisse nocentem" (288). Brutus compares Cato with the peaceful ethereal calm above this troubled world, and says: "otia solus ages" (267); Cato replies that the fabric of the universe is collapsing around them, and asks: "otia solus agam?" (295). [...] **It is possible that these were actually school subjects; we cannot prove it, but there must have been far more *suasoriae* in vogue than have survived, for even the Senecan collection is incomplete**.[27]

Seeing as Cato was a popular subject at rhetorical schools, would it be too daunting to surmise that at least the speeches made by Cato could have been thought up when Lucan took his classes? Bonner zooms in on one of Cato's speeches (IX.190-214) which he praises for its general structure, stating that "it is sententious without too much straining after effect; it makes skilful use of the rhetorical devices of parallelism, antithesis, and anaphora (especially 195-200), without the extreme artificiality of the celebrated prototype of Gorgias."[28]

A typical *suasoria*, according to Quintilian, displays a series of keynotes (*partes suadendi*), whereof the most prominent are *utile* (expediency) and *honestum* (honor). According to him (III.8.26), some theorists found *honestum* insufficient enough to warrant its own category, and felt it necessary to incorporate more keynotes to balance it out, such as *fas*, *iustum*, *pium*, *aequum*, and *mansuetum*. Bonner analyzes a speech made by Pothinus (VIII.484-535), which does feature most of the words in question, substituting *rectum* for *honestum*, and using *saevum* as the opposite of *mansuetum*[29], and concludes by stating "Is this merely coincidence? I do not think so, but rather that, when Lucan composed those lines, he had in his young mind the recollection of the *partes suadendi* as he had learnt them at school."[30] Taking Bonner's words into account, Lucan was certainly no stranger in

[27]Bonner 1966: 284-285 [emphasis mine]
[28]ibid. 276
[29]See §3.2.12.
[30]ibid. 287-288 [emphasis original]

knowing how to construct a speech and use words deemed requisite and appropriate for profound effect.

J. Mira Seo states that "[a]s a prodigy of the declamation schools, Lucan would have had much experience presenting both sides of Cato's dilemma, as the theme was a popular one in both oratorical and philosophical exercises."[31] Given this background, Lucan would have had plenty of time, even though he died relatively young, to fine-tune Cato's overall presentation in his poem. Cato's role in the Civil War in general and Lucan's epic in particular may be slight compared to those of Caesar and Pompey, but his significance here should nevertheless not be underestimated. Antony Snell, on the other hand, opines that "[t]he speeches in Lucan serve the same artistic purpose as they do in Thucydides, to bring author's comments in as part of the narrative events", and adds that "[t]he only character who is anywhere allowed to stand out above the events is Cato, **and this is because he represents the Rome of which the whole civil war is regarded as the suicide**."[32] This particular statement drives the point home with a vengeance—the Civil War came to mark the end of Rome as Cato knew it, and the use of "suicide" here is a very clever twist on what befell him.

Of the 8,060 verses that constitute *Bellum Civile*, 2,586 of them are occupied by speeches—119 in all, made by a total of 52 characters/groups of people.[33] Of these, 21 of them mention *libertas* or *liber*. Four of them are made by Cato, the rest by a total of 14 characters/groups of people. Caesar, Pompey, and Cornelia each make two; the others (Brutus, Cleopatra, Cotta, Domitius, Figulus, Labienus, Lentulus, Petreius, Pothinus, the Massiliots, and Vulteius) provide one each.

Starting with the following chapter, I shall first analyze all 21 speeches featuring the word *libertas*, and in order to paint a broader picture—and taking a cue from Kimmerle—I have also decided to address the speeches that contain the adjective *liber*, simply to add some more meat to the general discussion. A more in-depth discussion on *libertas* will be presented in Chapter 4, with especial focus on the portrayals of Cato, Caesar, and Pompey. By focusing on what shade(s) of meaning can be discerned from the words in question, I hope to be able to shed some more light on how Lucan uses them in *Bellum Civile*.

---

[31]Seo 2011: 201
[32]Snell 1939: 89 [emphasis mine]
[33]A full list can be found in the Appendix.

3. Analysis

In this chapter I shall investigate the speeches that mention *libertas* and *liber*. I begin with Cato; the others are presented in alphabetical order.

3.1 Cato's speeches

3.1.1 *Libertas*

SPEECH 1 (II.286-323)

Of the four speeches made by Cato, this one has received the most scrutiny; Lebek (1976) and Thorne (2010) in particular have adopted the piece-by-piece approach by dividing the text into sections, complete with headings (the entire speech is presented below using Thorne's translation).

Brutus, Cato's nephew and posthumous son-in-law, arrives unannounced in the dead of night to seek his uncle's advice regarding participation in the war. Before Cato gets to speak, Brutus delivers a speech (as can be found in §3.2.1.) in which he stresses the futility in participating in this *nefas* (sacrilege) that is the civil war, arguing that Cato has no business in partaking thereof if he knows what is best for himself. Cato, in turn, responds with what Lucan terms *sacrae voces* (holy words; 285). Thorne points out that "this choice of wording [...] frames Cato's speech as the functional equivalent of a divine oracle".[34]

"summum, Brute, nefas ciuilia bella fatemur,
sed quo fata trahunt uirtus secura sequetur.
crimen erit superis et me fecisse nocentem.
sidera quis mundumque uelit spectare cadentem
expers ipse metus? quis, cum ruat arduus aether,
terra labet mixto coeuntis pondere mundi,
complossas tenuisse manus? gentesne furorem
Hesperium ignotae Romanaque bella sequentur
diductique fretis alio sub sidere reges,
otia solus agam? procul hunc arcete furorem,
o superi, motura Dahas ut clade Getasque
securo me Roma cadat. ceu morte parentem

"The greatest *nefas* of all, Brutus, is civil war, I agree—but where *fatum* pulls me, *virtus* will follow safe and unharmed. The guilt will lie with the gods for having made even me guilty. Who would want to watch the stars and the universe collapsing while he himself remained free from any fearful concern? Who, when the lofty skies come rushing down, when the earth crumbles to pieces under the collected weight of a universe collapsing upon itself, would want to keep his hands tightly clasped? When peoples unknown to us will follow our Hesperian madness and our Roman wars, and kings too separated from us by ocean shores under foreign skies, shall I alone conduct a life of leisure? Drive far away this source of shame, O gods, that Rome—she who, by her ruin, will move the Dahae and the Getae to action—should fall while I stood by safe and

[34]Thorne 2010: 146

natorum orbatum longum producere funus
ad tumulos iubet ipse dolor, iuuat ignibus atris
inseruisse manus constructoque aggere busti
ipsum atras tenuisse faces, **non ante reuellar**
exanimem quam te conplectar, Roma; ***tuumque nomen, Libertas, et inanem persequar umbram***.
sic eat: inmites Romana piacula diui
plena ferant, nullo fraudemus sanguine bellum.
o utinam caelique deis Erebique liceret
hoc caput in cunctas damnatum exponere poenas!
deuotum hostiles Decium pressere cateruae:
me geminae figant acies, me barbara telis
Rheni turba petat, cunctis ego peruius hastis
excipiam medius totius uolnera belli.
hic redimat sanguis populos, hac caede luatur,
quidquid Romani meruerunt pendere mores.
ad iuga cur faciles populi, cur saeua uolentes
regna pati pereunt? me solum inuadite ferro,
me frustra leges et inania iura tuentem.
hic dabit hic pacem iugulus finemque malorum
gentibus Hesperiis: post me regnare uolenti
non opus est bello. quin publica signa ducemque
Pompeium sequimur? nec, si fortuna fauebit,
hunc quoque totius sibi ius promittere mundi
non bene conpertum est: ideo me milite uincat,
ne sibi se uicisse putet."

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

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

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

May this blood redeem the people, this death absolve whatever debt it is that Roman immorality must pay.

Why are the people so quick to the yoke, why so willing to perish just to endure cruel tyranny? Pierce me alone with the sword, watching in vain over hollow laws.

This very throat right here will bring about peace and an end of evils for the people of Italy—after me, he who wants to rule will have no need for war. Indeed, why don't I follow Republican standards with Pompey as my leader? It is certainly no secret that, if Fortune should favor him, he too seeks for himself right of mastery over the whole world. Therefore let him conquer with me as his soldier lest he think that he conquered for himself."

Cato admits that civil war is detestable, yet he cannot bring himself to remain aloof from the ravaging horrors; the future of Rome is at stake, and as a statesman, he feels obliged to participate in the fray. Just like a mourning father leads his son's funeral procession, Cato considers it his duty to be in the vanguard should Rome fall. The two most important words here, I feel, are *non ... revellar* ("I will not be pulled away"; 301); they indicate that nothing can keep him from being where the action is. Indeed, so committed is he to Rome and her woes that he is willing to sacrifice his very life, making a sly reference to Publius Decius Mus (consul 340 BC) who underwent a ritual called *devotio*, in which he chose to sacrifice himself so that his troops could achieve victory. By offering himself up in this manner, Cato hopes that his example will inspire others to uphold, if not the Republic, then at least *libertas* as an ideal. He resolves to join Pompey's side since Pompey, who enjoys the support of the Senate, is, as he sees it, the lesser of two evils; yet he makes it quite clear at the end of his speech that he is intent on checking Pompey should he show the slightest inclination to impose a dictatorship, as a reminder that he may not make any gains unto himself. Furthermore, Cato's main aim is to serve Rome and spare her from the onset of tyranny, whoever the victor may be.

Of particular note is that here Cato addresses *libertas* as though it were an animate being. By phrasing it that way, Lucan adds dramatic flair to the plot, giving the impression that Cato and *libertas* are intimately linked (of all the times the word *libertas* occurs throughout the poem—no less than thirty—only here does it occur in the vocative case). Directly after mentioning *libertas*, Cato speaks of an *inanis umbra* (empty shade), which sounds rather alarming. What exactly is he intimating here? Is freedom as he knows it already dead and gone? Thorne has this to say regarding the use of *inanis*: "... Cato's use of *inanis* is a recognition of its very need to be commemorated. In short, *Libertas* is 'empty' precisely because it is in imminent danger of being abandoned and forgotten. [...] Cato thus acknowledges the real danger to the survival of *Roma* and *Libertas*. In this speech he concedes that they will be defeated but illustrates by way of their funeral simile that such defeat does not need to be the end of the story. They may be *inanes* now, but Cato does not intend for them to remain mere empty shades forever."[35] Furthermore, Thorne claims that "[Cato's] true goal is not to *save Roma* and *Libertas* but instead to *commemorate* them, to ensure their preservation through the effective power of memory and so rescue them from the true death of being forgotten."[36] Yet is this really the case? If we are to follow Thorne, then it looks as though *libertas*, as it appears in this particular context, is beyond salvation and set to suffer the same fate as the Republic itself. For if Cato is set on commemorating rather than saving *libertas*, it entails thus that he is aware that the Republic is doomed beyond recall, which in a way serves to justify his resolve to sacrifice himself in battle (309-319). Of especial notice is *hic redimat sanguis populos, hac caede luatur / quidquid Romani meruerunt pendere mores* ("may this blood redeem the people, this death absolve whatever debt it is that Roman immorality must pay"; 312-313); here Cato seems to feel that his blood—and, by extension, death—in particular is pure enough to compensate for what "Roman immorality" has brought to bear on the Republic he knows and loves, and hopes that his death will render future wars unnecessary. Furthermore, he even asks why people are so eager to enslave and submit themselves to tyranny, not to mention giving up their very lives in the process (314-315). This clearly shows that he bemoans those who choose to sacrifice *libertas*—not just their own, but also that of the Republic—simply because they cannot, or are disinclined to, fend for themselves.

[35]Thorne 2010: 166
[36]ibid. 181 [emphasis original]

A thorough perusal of the speech leaves me with the impression that Cato is caught between pessimism and optimism. His inner pessimist seems to say "A republicless future is not worth the while, for the odds favoring its survival are downright nil"; and as for his inner optimist: "I shall fight using all the powers at my disposal to ensure that the name of *libertas* not be swept unto oblivion". As much as Cato feels disconcerted by the present state of affairs, he must participate in the war, for he knows that to do otherwise would constitute a dishonorable act towards the Republic. His aim is clear: he wants to prevent Rome from transforming into tyranny—Caesar in particular must not emerge victorious, yet Pompey, though endorsed by the Senate, is not really any better himself. Cato's words effectively trump Brutus', in the process inciting a fighting spirit within Brutus that culminated in the events on the Ides of March, 44 BCE (323-325); whether or not Cato was directly responsible for this is a matter of conjecture.

SPEECH 2 (IX.190-214)

This speech has been addressed by, among others, Pavan (1954/55), Lintott (1971), Ahl (1974), George (1991), Sklenář (2003), Stover (2008), Crutchfield (2015), and Kimmerle (2015). Duff (1928) quotes Macaulay who has this to say about the speech: "a pure gem of rhetoric without one flaw and, in my opinion, not very far from historical truth."[37] It is delivered in the aftermath of Pompey's death following his escape to Egypt after the battle of Pharsalus. Here Cato provides his audience, consisting of Pompey's soldiers and their Cilician allies, led by Tarcondimotus, with a neat encapsulation of Pompey's (un)doings. It is presented in its entirety below (translation by Sklenář).

"ciuis obit," inquit "**multum maioribus inpar**
nosse modum iuris, sed in hoc tamen utilis aeuo,
cui non ulla fuit iusti reuerentia; ***salua***
libertate potens, et solus plebe parata
priuatus seruire sibi, rectorque senatus,
sed regnantis, erat. nil belli iure poposcit,
quaeque dari uoluit uoluit sibi posse negari.
inmodicas possedit opes, sed plura retentis
intulit. inuasit ferrum, sed ponere norat.
praetulit arma togae, sed pacem armatus amauit.
iuuit sumpta ducem, iuuit dimissa potestas.
casta domus luxuque carens corruptaque numquam
fortuna domini. clarum et uenerabile nomen
gentibus et multum nostrae quod proderat urbi.

"A citizen has died," he said. "**He was far inferior to our ancestors in understanding the limits of legality**; still, in this age that has never had any respect for justice, he was beneficial. **He was powerful, yet liberty remained intact**; when the rabble were prepared to be his slaves, he alone abstained from public office; he had dominion over the Senate—but of a Senate that itself was dominant. He demanded nothing under the prerogative of war, and whatever he wished to be given to him, he wished it possible to be denied him.

He possessed immoderate wealth, but he paid into the fisc more than he kept. He grasped the sword, but he also knew how to lay it down.

He preferred war to the peacetime toga, but as soon as he was armed, it was peace that he loved. As a general, he enjoyed taking power and enjoyed resigning it. His household was chaste and free from luxury, never tainted by its master's fortune. His name is illustrious and revered throughout the world, and it has been of great profit to our Rome.

[37] Duff 1928: 520 n.2

olim uera fides Sulla Marioque receptis
libertatis obit: Pompeio rebus adempto 205
nunc et ficta perit. non iam regnare pudebit,
nec color imperii nec frons erit ulla senatus.
o felix, cui summa dies fuit obuia uicto
et cui quaerendos Pharium scelus obtulit enses.
forsitan in soceri potuisses uiuere regno. 210
scire mori sors prima uiris, set proxima cogi.
et mihi, si fatis aliena in iura uenimus,
fac talem, Fortuna, Iubam; non deprecor hosti
seruari, dum me seruet ceruice recisa."

Genuine belief in liberty died when Marius and Sulla were admitted into the city; now that Pompey has been taken from this world, even the fiction of belief has perished. No one will be ashamed to hold dominion; there will be no legalistic pretense of military command, nor will the Senate serve as a false front.

How lucky you were that you faced your final day in defeat and that Egyptian criminality brought you the swords whose points you should have sought! Perhaps you could have lived on under your father-in-law's dominion. Knowing how to die is the best quality for real men to have; the second best is to be forced to die. And if, by fate, I come under another man's power—ah, Fortune, make Juba do the same to me. I do not begrudge him keeping me for my enemy, provided that he keep me with my head cut off."

There appears to be a eulogy (191-203) sandwiched in between two points of criticism here: Cato begins by referring to Pompey as a *civis*, as if to deny the fact that Pompey was once a distinguished general; he goes on to say that he was *multum maioribus inpar / nosse modum iuris* ("far inferior to our ancestors in understanding the limits of legality"; 190-191), serving to paint him in rather unflattering colors. The second point (208-209) is no less unrelenting; Cato asserts that it was fortunate that Pompey died when he did. George offers an interesting paraphrase: " 'Had he lived, he would not have acted heroically; it is good that he died before he embarrassed the cause.' "[38]

It is no secret that Cato and Pompey were not natural bedfellows, for they had a long history of mutual disagreement which was exacerbated when Pompey and Caesar established their triumvirate, and even though Cato never really thought highly of him, he knew better than to defame Pompey outright, seeing as Pompey, more so than Caesar, acted in a manner that was at times beneficial to the Republic. Looking closer at the speech, the eulogy covers half its contents; Cato is effectively praising and blaming Pompey in equal proportions. Given his prior beef with Pompey, one should take Cato's words, especially at 195-200, with a pinch of salt. Jaeger (1932) in particular suggests that Lucan here resorts to poetic licence by having Cato rejoicing at the news of Pompey's death.[39]

As regards *libertas*, it is mentioned twice here. In the first instance it seems to refer to senatorial freedom; Cato lauds Pompey for being *salva / libertate potens* ("powerful, yet liberty remained intact"; 192-193)—i.e., the Senate had some semblance of control—yet later on (204-206) he states that sincere belief in Rome's freedom died when Sulla and Marius were in power (the 80s BCE), and now that Pompey is gone, so is the fiction of belief (*ficta*). Apparently, it seems that Cato is here of the

[38]George 1991: 255
[39]Jaeger 1932: 37

belief that *libertas* as a concept slowly but surely became more like a figure of speech already before the formation of the Triumvirate. Consider what George has to say: "...for Cato, *libertas* under Pompey is *ficta* [...], and Pompey's army fights for a Republic that is but a façade. Pompey, however, was useful, for he was a step better than Caesar. [...] Nevertheless his army still fought for the wrong reasons. Cato must change that."[40] I gather from *libertas ficta* that it is to be construed as some kind of freedom that Cato refuses to recognize as inherently genuine. Given his prior animosity towards Pompey, one would get the impression that whatever freedom there was under Pompey's rule did not amount to much; Sklenář goes one step further by asserting that this particular *libertas* was an "outright pretense".[41]

Lebek, on the other hand, is not so sure. He senses a contradiction lurking beneath the surface here, in which the two forms of *fides libertatis* (*vera* and *ficta*) are vying for position to cover the time of Pompey's rule. His take on *libertas salva* is to be construed as something untarnished.[42]

One should also consider the very point in time here. This speech is made after the events of Pharsalus, when the fortunes of the Republic, and hence *libertas*, changed utterly, yet Cato is referring to a time before their downfall. Given that Lucan sought to recast the face of post-Pharsalus *libertas* as something that was mainly anti-Caesarian, reading this particular speech in that light gives it an extra dimension. Cato and Pompey, both fighting against Caesar, seem to join forces here, albeit indirectly. The message here is clear: any reference made to *libertas* after Pharsalus is meant to downsize the very significance of Caesar.

---

[40]George 1991: 255

[41]"After Marius and Sulla, there was only *ficta fides libertatis*. Thus, the commitment to *libertas* that Cato demonstrated in book 2 was not just a mere name and shadow of its former self; it was an outright pretense. So, too, was the *libertas* in *salva / libertate potens*; Cato turns his earlier compliment to Pompey into a vicious backhand by insisting on the fraudulence of the *libertas* that Pompey left intact. The death of Pompey removes even this fake *libertas*, as well as the pretext of constitutional legitimacy. *Nunc et ficta perit* also retrojects itself upon the authorial *partes Libertatis* (9.29-30) and Cornelia's *partes pro libertate* (9.97): on the one hand, Pompey's faction is completely devoted to *libertas*, not even in name. By Cato's own account, then, such devotion is a fiction in the first instance, and the object of devotion is an illusion" (2003: 84).

[42]Lebek 1976: 243

SPEECH 3 (IX.256-283)

This speech has been touched upon by Ahl (1976), George (1991), Sklenář (2003), Rolim de Moura (2010), and Crutchfield (2015), among others. These words are spoken upon Pompey's troops' and the Cilicians' declaring that they wish to lay down their arms and go home, their main argument being that they fought strictly for Pompey and now see no point in fighting any longer. Cato scolds them for giving up arms and urges them to fight for a better cause: the Republic, and especially *libertas*. He tells them that Pompey used them to further an agenda nothing short of despicable in the eyes of Cato; should they choose to desert and submit to Caesar, they are doing themselves an enormous disfavor, so his argument goes. It is presented in its entirety below.

"ergo pari uoto gessisti bella, iuuentus,
tu quoque pro dominis, et Pompeiana fuisti
non Romana manus? quod non in regna laboras,
quod tibi, non ducibus, uiuis morerisque, quod orbem
adquiris nulli, quod iam tibi uincere tutum est,
bella fugis **quaerisque iugum ceruice uacanti
et nescis sine rege pati**. nunc causa pericli
digna uiris. potuit uestro Pompeius abuti
sanguine: ***nunc patriae iugulos ensesque negatis,
cum prope libertas?*** unum fortuna reliquit
iam tribus e dominis. pudeat: plus regia Nili
contulit in leges et Parthi militis arcus.
ite, o degeneres, Ptolemaei munus et arma
spernite. quis uestras ulla putet esse nocentes
caede manus? credet faciles sibi terga dedisse,
credet ab Emathiis primos fugisse Philippis.
uadite securi; meruistis iudice uitam
Caesare non armis, non obsidione subacti.
o famuli turpes, domini post fata prioris
itis ad heredem. cur non maiora mereri
quam uitam ueniamque libet? rapiatur in undas
infelix coniunx Magni prolesque Metelli,
ducite Pompeios, Ptolemaei uincite munus.
nostra quoque inuiso quisquis feret ora tyranno
non parua mercede dabit: sciat ista iuventus
ceruicis pretio bene se mea signa secutam.
quin agite et magna meritum cum caede parate:
ignauum scelus est tantum fuga."

"It seems then, soldiers, that you too fought with the same desire as others, in defence of tyranny—that you were the troops of Pompey, and not of Rome. You no longer suffer in order to set up a tyrant; your life and death belong to yourselves, not to your leaders; there is no one for whom you gain the whole world, and now you may safely conquer for yourselves alone. Yet now you desert the ranks; **you miss the yoke when your neck is relieved, and you cannot endure existence without a tyrant**. But you have now a quarrel worthy of brave men. Pompey was suffered to make full use of your life-blood: **now, when freedom is in sight, do you refuse to fight and die for your country?** Out of three masters Fortune has spared but one. Shame on you! The court of Egypt and the bow of the Parthian soldier have done more for the cause of lawful government.

Depart, degenerate men, neglectful alike of Ptolemy's gift and your own weapons. Who would suppose that your hands were ever stained with bloodshed? Caesar will take your word for it that you were quick to turn your backs to him, and first in the flight from Philippi in Thessaly. Go and fear not: if Caesar be your judge, you, who were not subdued by battle or siege, have deserved to have your lives spared.

Base slaves! your former master is dead, and you welcome his heir. Why do you not seek to earn a greater reward than mere life and pardon?

Seize the hapless wife of Magnus and the daughter of Metellus, and carry her over the sea; lead captive the sons of Pompey; and so outdo the gift of Ptolemy.

Also, whoever bears my head to the hated tyrant will receive no small reward for his gift. By the price of my head your troops will learn that they did well to follow my standard.

Rouse up therefore, commit a mighty crime, and gain your reward. **Mere flight is the crime of cowards**."

There is here a clear tone of disapproval in Cato's voice. He addresses them first as *iuventus* (main meaning "youth", but in this case "soldiers"), then later on as *famuli turpes* ("base slaves"; 274)—Cato's invective seeks to drive the point home, and he is intent on letting his audience know that he means business.

"You have now a quarrel worthy of brave men," says he—why not seize it before it is too late? The last sentence in the speech (283) makes it quite clear that Cato is anxious to keep as many of them as possible on board.

What is interesting about this speech is the context in which *libertas* appears. Bexley observes that Cato has no chance of salvaging the political system that he wishes to uphold, and therefore opts for the "personal freedom of the individual".[43] Crutchfield states that Cato rebukes the troops for being ignorant of the freedom that is offered to them now that Pompey is gone, and urges them to fight against the potential tyranny that Cato senses will lie in waiting.[44] *Libertas* in this case can be interpreted as either personal freedom or freedom from tyranny—both seem equally plausible, as opposed to Rolim de Moura who states that it "cannot mean anything but inner freedom, or perhaps freedom acquired through death".[45]

Just like in the first speech, Cato resorts to antithesis to emphasize his message of embracing *libertas*. Two words in particular (*iugum* and *rege*) have strong connotations with tyranny; in the first speech, we encounter the forms *iuga* and *regna*. *Regnum* was a much-loathed word in Republican times, due to its authoritarian nature—it was pretty much regarded as the polar opposite of the Republic. Cato uses *iugum* to evoke images of slavery, and is clearly disgusted by those who willingly submit themselves thereto; doing so is not just senseless and base, but also detrimental to the Republic itself. Ahl (1976) observes that these particular soldiers have no grasp on freedom for its own sake, but instead tend to entrust themselves to an individual leader who claims to represent it.[46] Whoever turns his back on *libertas* is a spineless wretch, is what Cato is really trying to say here.

In fine, Cato manages to win the day and, according to George, "[w]ith this speech a truly Republican army is born, one that fights for the proper cause, *libertas*. Cato has given them a cause that is worthy of free men, not slaves."[47] Stover has the following to add: "the removal of Pompey has created the

[43]Bexley 2010: 150
[44]Crutchfield 2015: 96
[45]Rolim de Moura 2010: 77
[46]"Soldiers such as these are in constant danger of confusing true *virtus* or *pietas* with what Vulteius calls *militiae pietas*. They are, in effect, transposing their dedication from the ideal of *libertas* to an individual leader. For this reason Cato regards Pompey's defeat and death, which is to some republicans the final defeat of their cause, as a benefit to the struggle for liberty rather than a loss" (1976: 255).
[47]George 1991: 256

opportunity for the war to be about something grander than the dynastic ambitions of two powerful generals. And Cato's words hit their mark. The result of his exhortation to the fleeing troops is a renewal of their purpose. They no longer struggle to champion the claims of an individual (Pompey); rather they now join Cato in fighting for a good cause (*libertas*)."[48] Lucan himself points out that after Pharsalus, the war took on a whole new guise: the Republic (i.e. Cato) vs. Caesar (VII.695-696). With Pompey now out of the way, Cato can take on a more active role and further the cause of *libertas* to the utmost of his abilities. He is now on a more equal footing with Caesar.

The pessimist we encountered in the first speech is all but gone here. In this speech we find a more confident, brazen Cato ready and willing to prove his mettle (note also the change in demeanor: calm and reserved in the former; stern and no-nonsense in the latter). He knows that if he is to succeed against Caesar, he must convince and, more importantly, motivate Pompey's already war-weary veterans to aid his cause. Cato eventually wound up losing both the battle and the war, though he did not know it at the time.

3.1.2 *Liber*

SPEECH 4 (IX.566-584)

Of Cato's speeches dealing with *liber(tas)*, this one has been addressed the least; Ahl (1976: 262-268) offers a decent discussion thereof. This speech occurs at the temple of Jupiter Ammon in Africa, in response to Labienus' urging Cato to consult its oracle (see §3.2.8.). It is presented in its entirety below.

ille deo plenus tacita quem mente gerebat
effudit **dignas adytis e pectore uoces.**
"quid quaeri, Labiene, iubes? ***an liber in armis occubuisse uelim potius quam regna uidere?***
an sit uita nihil sed longa an differat aetas?
an noceat uis nulla bono fortunaque perdat
opposita uirtute minas, laudandaque uelle
sit satis et numquam successu crescat honestum?
scimus, et hoc nobis non altius inseret Hammon.
haeremus cuncti superis, temploque tacente
nil facimus non sponte dei; nec uocibus ullis

Cato, inspired by the god whom he bore hidden in his heart,
poured forth **from his breast an answer worthy of the oracle itself:**
"What question do you bid me ask, Labienus? **Whether I would rather fall in battle, a free man, than witness a tyranny?**
Whether it makes no difference if life be long or short?
Whether violence can ever hurt the good, or Fortune threatens in vain when Virtue is her antagonist? Whether the noble purpose is enough, and virtue becomes no more virtuous by success?
I can answer these questions, and the oracle will never fix the truth deeper in my heart. We men are all inseparable from the gods, and, even if the oracle be dumb, all our actions are predetermined by Heaven.

[48]Stover 2008: 575

numen eget, **dixitque semel nascentibus auctor quidquid scire licet.** sterilesne elegit harenas
ut caneret paucis, mersitque hoc puluere uerum,
estque dei sedes nisi terra et pontus et aer
et caelum et uirtus? superos quid quaerimus ultra?
Iuppiter est quodcumque uides, quodcumque moueris.
sortilegis egeant dubii semperque futuris
casibus ancipites: me non oracula certum
sed mors certa facit. pauido fortique cadendum est:
hoc satis est dixisse Iouem."

The gods have no need to speak; **for the Creator told us once for all at our birth whatever we are permitted to know.** Did he choose these barren sands, that a few might hear his voice? did he bury truth in this desert? Has he any dwelling-place save earth and sea, the air of heaven and virtuous hearts? Why seek we further for deities?

All that we see is God; every motion we make is God also.

Men who doubt and are ever uncertain of future events—let *them*[49] cry out for prophets: I draw my assurance from no oracle but from the sureness of death. The timid and the brave must fall alike; the god has said this, and it is enough."

Liber in this case entails personal freedom of action, made possible by suicide.[50] Cato knows that tyranny entails loss of liberty, and so would rather die in battle than endure tyranny, because at least then he would still be able to act freely. Furthermore, it is interesting here that Cato poses a series of questions for Labienus all beginning with *an*, a great example of anaphora in which the first syllable of that particular word is used, giving the speech an, albeit unintended, humorous effect. Cato declines to consult the oracle simply because he finds it unnecessary to do so; he states explicitly that he himself has full knowledge (*scimus*), and therefore has no need to resort to secondary measures. Here the Stoic in him comes out to play: everything is predetermined, and if the gods want us to know how the war turns out, they would have done so already, he basically says (*dixitque semel nascentibus auctor / quidquid scire licet*; 575-576). Cato asserts that oracles are only for those who are unsure about their own future. As far as he is concerned, he is aware of his own mortality—what else does he need to know other than that he will eventually die?[51] Furthermore, his response, according to Lucan, is equivalent to that of the oracle itself (*dignas adytis ... voces*; 565).

3.1.3 Summary of Cato's speeches

Having analyzed Cato's speeches, one can conclude that *libertas* can be viewed in various ways. In the first speech, we encounter a Cato who seems convinced that freedom—both Republican as well as senatorial—is doomed, nothing more than an empty shade, yet he decides to act on its behalf anyway,

[49]Emphasis original
[50]Kimmerle 2015: 209
[51]Ahl (1976) makes the following insightful observations: "...if Cato consults the oracle, he may well learn of the catastrophe awaiting the republican cause at Thapsus, and, perhaps, of his own death at Utica. While such foreknowledge would probably not affect Cato detrimentally, it would certainly jeopardize the morale of his troops" (263); "Cato's own credibility has been on trial here, as has the faith of his troops in their goal. Not only would a consultation of Ammon have revealed, perhaps, the doom of the army at Thapsus, it would have sapped the soldiers' confidence in both leader and cause" (266).

more out of a sense of patriotic duty than personal convictions. In the second speech, he states that general belief in freedom died already in the days of Sulla and Marius (then again, freedom and dictatorship are not particularly compatible, so Cato may have a point here) only to be supplanted by what he calls a *ficta fides libertatis* which perished along with Pompey. Yet in the third speech, he suddenly seems more optimistic—there might still be hope for *libertas* after all, albeit in a more personal rather than political sense. What could have brought on this change in perception? Could it be that Cato is more convinced about the potential survival of *libertas* now that he has entered the war and assumed command over Pompey's forces? Perhaps some long-forgotten fighting spirit has crept up within him and provoked him into refusing to believe that the Republic is dying? Or is Lucan perchance to blame for portraying him in this fashion?

In the fourth speech, *liber* refers not only to Cato's personal status—he is "free" in the sense that he is not a slave and that he can do as he pleases—but also to freedom of action. If freedom is lost in the aftermath of tyranny, then Cato is willing to sacrifice himself because dying freely is preferable to having to live deprived of freedom.

Given that Lucan treats Cato in a more favorable manner compared to Caesar and Pompey, it is tempting to believe that some of Cato's words might echo Lucan's own sentiments; indeed, one could be inclined to claim that Lucan uses Cato to channel his own thoughts, though Lintott, on the other hand, is more skeptical.[52] The fact that both of them subscribed to Stoicism factors in highly in this case. How much of the contents Cato himself would have been likely to utter is hard to tell though; Goar, on the other hand, is convinced that the reason Cato gives for joining the war in II.321-322 is "undoubtedly that of the historical Cato".[53]

3.2 Speeches made by other characters

Below are presented the speeches made by other characters featuring both *libertas* and *liber*.

[52]"The attitude that Lucan ascribes to Cato in 49 probably does not represent Cato's real feelings" (1971: 500).
[53]Goar 1987: 43

3.2.1 Brutus (II.242-284)

Brutus, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, visits Cato and advises him not to participate in the war. It is presented in its entirety below.

"omnibus expulsae terris olimque fugatae
uirtutis iam sola fides, quam turbine nullo
excutiet fortuna tibi, tu mente labantem
derige me, dubium certo tu robore firma.
namque alii Magnum uel Caesaris arma sequantur,
dux Bruto Cato solus erit. pacemne tueris
inconcussa tenens dubio uestigia mundo,
an placuit ducibus scelerum populique furentis
cladibus inmixtum ciuile absoluere bellum?
quemque suae rapiunt scelerata in proelia causae:
hos polluta domus legesque in pace timendae,
hos ferro fugienda fames mundique ruinae
permiscenda fides. nullum furor egit in arma;
castra petant magna uicti mercede: tibi uni
per se bella placent? quid tot durare per annos
profuit inmunem corrupti moribus aeui?
hoc solum longae pretium uirtutis habebis:
accipient alios, facient te bella nocentem.
ne tantum, o superi, liceat feralibus armis,
has etiam mouisse manus. nec pila lacertis
missa tuis caeca telorum in nube ferentur:
ne tanta in cassum uirtus eat, ingeret omnis
se belli fortuna tibi. quis nolet in isto
ense mori, quamuis alieno uolnere labens,
et scelus esse tuum? melius tranquilla sine armis
otia solus ages, sicut caelestia semper
inconcussa suo uoluuntur sidera lapsu.
fulminibus propior terrae succenditur aer,
imaque telluris uentos tractusque coruscos
flammarum accipiunt: nubes excedit Olympus.
lege deum minimas rerum discordia turbat,
pacem magna tenent. quam laetae Caesaris aures
accipient tantum uenisse in proelia ciuem!
nam praelata suis numquam diuersa dolebit
castra ducis Magni. nimium placet ipse Catoni,
si bellum ciuile placet. pars magna senatus
et duce priuato gesturus proelia consul
sollicitant proceresque alii; ***quibus adde Catonem***
sub iuga Pompei, toto iam liber in orbe
solus Caesar erit. quod si pro legibus arma
ferre iuuat patriis libertatemque tueri,
nunc neque Pompei Brutum neque Caesaris hostem,
post bellum uictoris habes."

"Virtue, long ago driven out and banished from every land, finds in you her one remaining support, and will never be dislodged from your breast by any turn of fortune; do you therefore guide my hesitation and fortify my weakness with your unerring strength.

Let others follow Magnus or Caesar's arms—Brutus will own no leader but Cato. Are you the champion of peace, keeping your path unshaken amid a tottering world? Or have you resolved to stand with the arch-criminals and take your share in the disasters of a mad world, and so clear the civil war of guilt?

Each man is carried away to wicked warfare by motives of his own—some by crimes of private life and fear of the laws if peace be kept; others by the need to drive away hunger by the sword and to bury bankruptcy under the destruction of the world. None has been driven to arms by mere impulse: they have been bought by a great bribe to follow the camp; do you alone choose war for its own sake? What good was it to stand firm so many years, untouched by the vices of a profligate age? This will be your sole reward for the virtue of a lifetime—that war, which finds others already guilty, will make you guilty at last.

Heaven forbid that this fatal strife should have power to stir your hands also to action. Javelins launched by your arm will not hurtle through the indistinguishable cloud of missiles;
and, in order that all that virtue may not spend itself in vain, all the hazard of war will hurl itself upon you;
for who, though staggering beneath another's stroke, will not wish to fall by your sword and make you guilty?

Fitter than war for you is peaceful life and tranquil solitude, so the stars of heaven roll on for ever unshaken in their courses.

The part of air nearest earth is fired by thunderbolts, and the low-lying places of the world are visited by gales and long flashes of flame; but Olympus rises above the clouds.

It is heaven's law, that small things are troubled and distracted, while great things enjoy peace. What joyful news to Caesar's ear, that so great a citizen has joined the fray!

He will never resent your preference of his rival, of Pompey's camp to his own; for, if Cato countenances civil war, he countenances Caesar also more than enough.

When half the Senate, when the consuls and other nobles, mean to wage war under a leader who holds no office, the temptation is strong; **but, if Cato too submit like these to Pompey, Caesar will be the only free man on earth. If, however, we resolve to bear arms in defence of our country's laws and to maintain freedom, you behold in me one who is not now the foe of either Caesar or Pompey, though I shall be the foe of the conqueror when war is over."**

Brutus argues that Cato would be as guilty as his opponents should he decide to involve himself in the war; Cato would do best to devote himself to a life of peace and tranquillity, for, as Brutus sees it, Cato should know better than to get his hands dirty. It is clear here that Brutus abhors the whole situation, as exemplified by the last sentence in the speech—here he makes it clear that whoever prevails in the war will have him as their enemy, be it Caesar or Pompey (or even Cato for that matter, since Brutus is rather vague about who exactly the *post bellum victor* is). He finds it simply deplorable that one must resort to arms in order to preserve *libertas*—in his world, such an option should never have to present itself.

Liber in this case seems to imply "free" in the sense that Caesar is not dependent on the Senate to aid him in his scheme; he is able to act without resorting to auxiliaries. Brutus stresses the fact that Pompey held no magistracy at the time (*duce privato*; 278), yet he still had the majority of the Senate behind him. Furthermore, both Pompey and the Senate are dependent on each other, and if Cato were to join Pompey's side, even he would have to rely on the senators; Caesar is thus the only one left "free". Thorne's observation bears mention here: "If Cato were to fight against the tyrannical ambitions of Caesar by simply joining forces with another *dux* with tyrannical ambitions, then he would ironically forfeit that very *libertas* which he was fighting to protect. In such a case, if Cato were to lose his *virtus* and *libertas*—those very traits which make up the *exemplum* that his life can offer—Caesar would indeed be the last free man left [...]. In the end, as Brutus forcefully argues, it is in the interest not only of his own *virtus* and *libertas* but also of all those who might one day look to Cato as an *exemplum* that Cato should not and must not involve himself in the waging of civil war."[54]

Kimmerle also agrees in this case that Caesar would be the only free man left; furthermore, she states that Caesar, as an alleged champion of *libertas*, would contradict not just the entire context but even the expounded comprehension of *libertas* in the text itself.[55]

[54]Thorne 2010: 138-139; see also George (1991: 251).
[55]Kimmerle 2015: 175

3.2.2 Caesar

SPEECH 1 (III.134-140)

Caesar has just entered Rome and is about to sack the temple of Saturn, which then served as Rome's treasury, when he is thwarted by the tribune Metellus[56], who bars the doors for him and refuses to budge. Caesar responds as follows:

"uanam spem mortis honestae
concipis: haud" inquit "iugulo se polluet isto
nostra, Metelle, manus; dignum te Caesaris ira
nullus honor faciet. ***te uindice tuta relicta est libertas?*** non usque adeo permiscuit imis
longus summa dies ut non, si uoce Metelli
seruantur leges, malint a Caesare tolli."

"In vain, Metellus," he cried, "you hope for a glorious death:
never shall my hand be stained by your blood.
No office shall make you worthy of my wrath.
Are you the champion in whose charge freedom has been left for safety? The course of time has not wrought such confusion
that the laws would not rather be trampled on by Caesar
than saved by Metellus."

Lucan likens Metellus to a champion of *libertas* by writing *tamen exit in iram, / uiribus an possint obsistere iura, per unum / Libertas experta uirum* ("nevertheless, Freedom did break out in wrath and tried, in the person of one man, whether right could resist might"; 112-114); even Caesar seems to acknowledge this (*te vindice*; 137). If one is to believe Lucan, Caesar and *libertas* are incompatible, for Caesar is quick to notice that times have changed and that people are willing to pledge for security at the expense of liberty.

SPEECH 2 (VII.250-329)

Caesar gives a lengthy speech to his troops on the eve of Pharsalus. Verses 259-269 are given below.

"haec, fato quae teste probet, quis iustius arma
sumpserit; haec acies uictum factura nocentem est.
si pro me patriam ferro flammisque petistis,
nunc pugnate truces gladioque exsoluite culpam:
nulla manus, belli mutato iudice, pura est.
non mihi res agitur, sed, ***uos ut libera sitis turba***, precor gentes ut ius habeatis in omnes.
ipse ego priuatae cupidus me reddere uitae
plebeiaque toga modicum conponere ciuem,

"...and this day must decide, on the evidence of destiny, which of the two
combatants had justice on his side: this battle will pronounce the guilt of
him who loses it. If in defence of me you have attacked your native land
with fire and sword, fight fiercely to-day and use your swords to clear
your guilt. Not one of you has guiltless hands, if I be no longer the judge
of war. It is not my fortunes that are at stake: my prayer is for you—**that you, for your freedom's sake**, may bear rule over all nations.
My own desire is to return to private life, to wear the people's dress, and to
play the part of an ordinary citizen;

[56]Either Quintus Caecilius Metellus or Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (consul 52 BCE, listed as tribune of the plebs for 59); the text does not specify.

omnia dum uobis liceant, nihil esse recuso.
inuidia regnate mea."

but provided you are all-powerful, I am willing to accept any position:
yours be the kingly power, mine the discredit!"

Caesar does not perceive freedom in the same fashion as Cato or Pompey; *libera* in this case does not correspond to the republican order, but rather signifies the property of the victor. Should Caesar prevail, he would be free from (i.e., immune to) penalty and accusation, and blame is thereby accorded to the losing side. This particular *libertas* is of an outright perverse character, and it is clear that Lucan wants his readers not to associate Caesar with the kind of *libertas* consistent with the ways of the Republic. It is rather ironic that Caesar states that he aims to return to the life of a private man after the war (266)—Lucan seems intent on portraying him as a paragon of insincerity.

3.2.3 Cleopatra (X.85-103)

Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, makes a brief appearance in the last book, addressing Caesar upon his arrival thither. An excerpt from her speech appears below.

"lege summa perempti
uerba patris, qui iura mihi communia regni
et thalamos cum fratre dedit. ***puer ipse sororem,***
sit modo liber, amat; sed habet sub iure Pothini
adfectus ensesque suos."

"Read the last words of my dead father:
he gave me an equal share of the royal power with my brother,
and married me to him.
The boy himself loves his sister, if only he were free,
but his feelings and his soldiers are alike controlled by Pothinus."

Liber entails here a kind of personal freedom as experienced in a two-person relationship. In this case, Cleopatra's brother/husband Ptolemy XIII is not personally "free" to love her, since Pothinus, Pompey's killer, is in control of Ptolemy's emotions and desires.

3.2.4 Cornelia

SPEECH 1 (VIII.639-661)

Cornelia's first speech is made directly after watching her husband Pompey die from a distance, in which she seemingly blames herself for both his unfortunate demise and the outcome of the war itself. The first half is provided below.

"o coniunx, ego te scelerata peremi:
letiferae tibi causa morae fuit auia Lesbos,
et prior in Nili peruenit litora Caesar;
nam cui ius alii sceleris? sed, quisquis in istud
a superis inmisse caput uel Caesaris irae
uel tibi prospiciens, nescis, crudelis, ubi ipsa
uiscera sint Magni; properas atque ingeris ictus
qua uotum est uicto. poenas non morte minores
pendat et ante meum uideat caput. ***haud ego culpa libera bellorum***, quae matrum sola per undas
et per castra comes nullis absterrita fatis
uictum, quod reges etiam timuere, recepi."

"Dear husband, I am guilty of your death:
your fatal delay was caused by the remoteness of Lesbos,
and Caesar has reached the shore of Egypt before you;
none else could have power to command this crime. But whoever you are
who have been sent by Heaven against that life, whether serving the anger
of Caesar or your own, you know not, ruthless man, where the very heart
of Magnus lies; in haste you shower your blows where he, in his defeat,
welcomes them. Let him pay a penalty not less than death by seeing my
head fall first. **I am not blameless in respect of the war**;
for I was the only matron who followed him on sea
and in camp; I was deterred by no disasters, but harboured him in defeat,
which even kings were afraid to do."

Libera signifies here a certain condition: not being free from the fault of wars. Cornelia, simply by being Pompey's spouse, feels a certain kind of responsibility on her part for letting it all happen (not just the outbreak of war but also the death of her husband). Not knowing who took Pompey's life, she here disapproves of the manner of his execution, and wishes for his killer to witness her death, hoping that will bring him to his knees.

SPEECH 2 (IX.55-108)

Cornelia, recently widowed at the time of speaking, delivers a lengthy speech (54 lines) after learning of her husband's death, openly bemoaning her plight. She passes on a message from him to their sons Sextus and Gnaeus, prompting them to resume their father's struggle to topple Caesar, explicitly telling them not to let Caesar and his descendants be at peace (it should be noted here that only Sextus is addressed in the speech). At the end of the message is an exhortation for them to join Cato, who, at this point, has been designated as Pompey's successor. An excerpt featuring Pompey's message (87-97) is presented below.

"tu pete bellorum casus et signa per orbem,
Sexte, paterna moue; namque haec mandata reliquit
Pompeius uobis in nostra condita cura:
'me cum fatalis leto damnauerit hora,
excipite, o nati, bellum ciuile, nec umquam,
dum terris aliquis nostra de stirpe manebit,
Caesaribus regnare uacet. ***uel sceptra uel urbes***
libertate sua ualidas inpellite fama
nominis*: has uobis partes, haec arma relinquo.*
inueniet classes quisquis Pompeius in undas
uenerit, et noster nullis non gentibus heres
bella dabit: tantum indomitos memoresque paterni
iuris habete animos. ***uni parere decebit,***
si faciet partes pro libertate, Catoni.'"

"I bid you, Sextus, face the hazards of war and carry on your father's
warfare over all the world. For Pompey left this message for his sons, and
it is treasured up in my memory:
'When the destined hour shall have condemned me to death, I bid you,
my sons, take over civil war; and never, while any scion of my stock
remains on earth, let the Caesars reign in peace.
Rouse up by the glory of our name either kings or States
that are strong in their own freedom;
I leave you this part to play and these resources.
A Pompey who takes to the sea will always find fleets, and my successor
shall rouse all nations to war; only let your hearts be ever tameless and
mindful of your father's power.
Cato, and Cato alone, you may fitly obey, if he shall rally a party in
defence of freedom.'"

Here *libertas* is mentioned twice, though not in the same sentence, both occurring in Pompey's message. In the first instance Pompey, through Cornelia, wants their sons to call on their allies "that are strong in their own freedom" (*libertate sua validas*; 91), for without them they would not be able to prove a formidable foe to Caesar; Pompey, by formulating himself in this way, clearly wishes that his cause not be in vain. This is further reinforced by the second instance, where he urges them to come to Cato's aid, since Cato is here considered the sole defender of *libertas*. Judging by Pompey's message, Cato seems to have Pompey's full approval here, and, what is more, it is stated that no one else may assume the lead in the quest for liberty (*uni parere decebit, / si faciet partes pro libertate*; 96-97); apparently, Pompey is here of the belief that Cato is the man for the job. Even though they had a history of mutual uneasiness, given that they pursued conflicting agendas, they both agreed on one point: Caesar must be stopped at any cost. Indeed, Lucan himself mentions that *ille, ubi pendebant casus dubiumque manebat / quem dominum mundi facerent ciuilia bella, / oderat et Magnum, quamuis comes isset in arma / auspiciis raptus patriae ductuque senatus; / at post Thessalicas clades iam pectore toto / Pompeianus erat* ("while the issue remained uncertain, and none could tell whom the civil war would make master of the world, Cato hated Magnus as well as Caesar, though he had been swept away by his country's cause to follow the Senate to Pompey's camp; but now, after the defeat of Pharsalia, he favoured Pompey with his whole heart"; IX.19-24).

3.2.5 Cotta (III.145-152)

Directly following Caesar's first speech, with Metellus still holding firm, Cotta[57] enters the scene, delivering the following short speech:

"libertas" inquit "populi quem regna coercent	145	**"When a people is held down by tyranny," said Cotta, "freedom is**
libertate perit; cuius seruaueris umbram,		**destroyed by the freedom of speech; but you keep the semblance of**
si quidquid iubeare uelis. tot rebus iniquis		**freedom if you acquiesce in each behest of the tyrant.** Because we were
paruimus uicti; uenia est haec sola pudoris		conquered, we submitted to repeated acts of oppression; for our disgrace
degenerisque metus, nullam potuisse negari.		and ignoble fear there is but one excuse—that refusal was in no case
ocius auertat diri mala semina belli.	150	possible. Let Caesar with all speed carry off the baneful germs of cursed
damna mouent populos, siquos sua iura tuentur:		warfare. Loss of money touches nations that are protected by their own
non sibi sed domino grauis est quae seruit egestas."		laws; but the poverty of slaves is felt by their master, not by themselves."

[57]Possibly Lucius Aurelius Cotta (consul 65 BCE), whose sister Aurelia was Caesar's mother.

Cotta argues that freedom of speech is detrimental to liberty itself in times of tyranny, yet if one complies with the whims of a tyrant, one can maintain the "semblance of freedom" (*umbram*; 146), as he terms it. Ahl (1993) points out that Cotta's argument goes back to the early days of Stoicism, and further states that "Zeno, the founder of Stoicism ... declared a man is not a slave if he comes to terms with a tyrant, provided he acts of his own free will".[58] He is the only one throughout the poem to mention the word more than once within a sentence (*libertas ... libertate perit*), which is particularly noteworthy—he himself does not seem to believe in its significance, yet he is not above uttering that very word (it is indeed remarkable that Lucan has Cotta, a Caesarian and hence one of the "enemies" of *libertas*, say that word twice in the same sentence—could it be that Cotta himself is a closet champion, or is he saying it just to tease the pro-*libertas* faction?).

3.2.6 Domitius (VII.610-615)

Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus (consul 54 BCE) was Cato's brother-in-law and Nero's great-great-grandfather who, according to Lucan, fought on Pompey's side and died at Pharsalus.[59] Caesar, watching him draw his last breath, mocks him (606-607), yet Domitius manages to have the final say, uttering the following words before passing away:

"non te funesta scelerum mercede potitum	610	"Caesar, you have not grasped the fatal reward of your guilt:
sed dubium fati, Caesar, generoque minorem		your fate remains uncertain and you are inferior to your son-in-law;
aspiciens ***Stygias*** Magno duce ***liber ad umbras***		and seeing your plight, **I go free and untroubled to the Stygian shades,**
et securus eo: te, saeuo Marte subactum,		and Pompey is still my leader.
Pompeioque graues poenas nobisque daturum,		Though I die, I still can hope that you, borne down in fierce battle,
cum moriar, sperare licet."	615	will pay a heavy reckoning to Pompey and to me."

Domitius dies convinced that his side is to be regarded as the true champion of *libertas*; furthermore, even though he dies defeated, he views his own demise as an act of liberation. He even manages to get back at Caesar by telling him that his son-in-law (*gener*, i.e. Pompey) is the greater of the two, as well as seeming to prophesy Caesar's eventual demise.

---

[58] Ahl 1993: 137-138; see also Lebek (1976: 200) and Kimmerle (2015: 190).

[59] Dilke writes that "[t]he glorious death on the battlefield of Pharsalia accorded him in Book VII is as unhistorical as the presence of Cicero on that occasion: in fact he was killed in the mountains by [Mark] Antony's cavalry" (1972: 78). Lucan thus makes himself guilty of poetic licence.

3.2.7 Figulus (I.642-672)

Publius Nigidius Figulus (praetor 58 BCE), introduced in the poem as a man *cui cura deos secretaque caeli* / *nosse fuit, quem non stellarum Aegyptia Memphis* / *aequaret uisu numerisque sequentibus astra* ("whose study it was to know the gods and the secrets of the sky [...], whom not even Egyptian Memphis could match in observation of the heavens and calculations that keep pace with the stars"; 639-641), addresses the panic-stricken Romans. His speech concludes with a prophecy heralding the emergence of ghastly times to come (666-672):

"inminet armorum rabies, ferrique potestas
confundet ius omne manu, scelerique nefando
nomen erit uirtus, multosque exibit in annos
hic furor. et superos quid prodest poscere finem?
cum domino pax ista uenit. duc, Roma, malorum
continuam seriem clademque in tempora multa
extrahe ***ciuili tantum iam libera bello.***"

"The madness of war is upon us, when the power of the sword
shall violently upset all legality, and atrocious crime
shall be called heroism. This frenzy will last for many years;
and it is useless to pray Heaven that it may end:
when peace comes, a tyrant will come with it. Let Rome prolong
the unbroken series of suffering and draw out her agony for ages:
only while civil war lasts, shall she henceforth be free."

Figulus' use of *libera* is most alarming: Rome can only be free as long as civil war rages, and once it is all over, tyranny will set in and freedom as we know it will be quashed. Kimmerle notes that the *libertas* inherent here is far removed from an ideal, peaceful ancient condition of "freedom from violence"; it signifies a Rome in a state of suspense in which it is still existent.[60]

3.2.8 Labienus (IX.550-563)

Labienus[61], who partakes of Cato's trek through Africa, makes the following speech at the shrine of Jupiter Ammon urging Cato to consult its oracle.

"sors obtulit" inquit
"et fortuna uiae tam magni numinis ora
consiliumque dei: tanto duce possumus uti
per Syrtes, bellisque datos cognoscere casus.
nam cui crediderim superos arcana daturos
dicturosque magis, quam sancto, uera, Catoni?

"Chance," said he, "and the hazard of our march have put in our way the word of this mighty god and his divine wisdom; his powerful guidance we can enjoy through the Syrtes, and from him discover the issues appointed for the war.
I cannot believe that Heaven would reveal mysteries and proclaim truth to any man more than to the pure and holy Cato.

[60]Kimmerle 2015: 173

[61]Most likely Titus Labienus (tribune of the plebs 63 BCE), who served as one of Caesar's lieutenants in Gaul and later defected to Pompey after Caesar crossed the Rubicon. Caesar mentions a Labienus in Book 5 (*Caesareis Labienus erat*; 346), calling him a *transfuga vilis* ("despised deserter"). Judging by the wording, this must clearly be the same Labienus as encountered in Book 9.

certe uita tibi semper derecta supernas
ad leges, sequerisque deum. ***datur, ecce, loquendi cum Ioue libertas***: inquire in fata nefandi
Caesaris et patriae uenturos excute mores.
iure suo populis uti legumque licebit,
an bellum ciuile perit? **tua pectora sacra uoce reple**; durae saltem uirtutis amator
quaere quid est uirtus et posce exemplar honesti."

Assuredly you have ever ruled your life in accordance with divine law, and you are a follower after God. **And now behold! power is given you to speak with Jupiter**; ask then concerning the end of Caesar the abhorred, and search into the future condition of our country; will the people be allowed to enjoy their laws and liberties, or has the civil war been fought in vain? **Fill your breast with the god's utterance**; a lover of austere virtue, you should at least ask now what Virtue is and demand to see Goodness in her visible shape."

Libertas in this case refers not to either Republican/senatorial liberty or liberty from tyranny, but is to be read as a synonym for "opportunity"; Labienus is basically saying "you have now the opportunity to consult an oracle".

As mentioned earlier, Cato declines to consult the oracle and personally responds to Labienus' request. Ahl (1976) makes the following interesting observation: "There is humor in Labienus' naiveté. Standing before his eyes is the exemplar he would have Cato ask about—Cato himself. Lucan adds a touch of ambiguity to Labienus' own words in 561-562: 'tua pectora sacra / voce reple.' Since *sacra* is the very last word in 561, and since, as a result, its final syllable is of indeterminate length, Labienus' request yields one of two meanings: either 'Fill your heart with that holy voice [i.e., the voice of the *oracle*],' or 'Fill your holy heart with your voice.' Labienus clearly intends the first of these. But what follows is the fulfillment of the secondary meaning."[62]

3.2.9 Lentulus (VIII.331-453)

Lucius Cornelius Lentulus Crus (consul 49 BCE), present at Pompey's war council at Syhedra in the aftermath of Pharsalus, makes a lengthy speech (123 lines) berating Pompey for calling on the Parthians to aid him in the war. Two excerpts are provided below (331-341 and 368-371, respectively).

"sicine Thessalicae mentem fregere ruinae?
una dies mundi damnauit fata? secundum
Emathiam lis tanta datur? iacet omne cruenti
uolneris auxilium? solos tibi, Magne, reliquit
Parthorum fortuna pedes? quid transfuga mundi,
terrarum totos tractus caelumque perosus,
auersosque polos alienaque sidera quaeris,
Chaldaeos culture focos et barbara sacra
Parthorum famulus? ***quid causa obtenditur armis***

"Has the defeat of Pharsalia so utterly broken your spirit?
Has a single day fixed the world's destiny?
Is the mighty issue to be decided by the result of Pharsalia?
Is all cure for our bleeding wound impossible?
Has Fortune left you no course, Magnus, save fall at the Parthians' feet?
Why do you fly from our world, and shun whole regions of earth and sky?
why seek a heaven turned from ours and foreign stars,
in order to worship Chaldaean fires with savage rites, and to serve
Parthians? **Why was the love of freedom put forward as the pretext of**

[62]Ahl 1976: 264 [emphasis original]

libertatis amor? miserum quid decipis orbem,
si seruire potes?"

war? Why thus deceive a suffering world,
if you can stoop to be a slave to any?"

"Parthus per Medica rura,
Sarmaticos inter campos effusaque plano
Tigridis arua solo, ***nulli superabilis hosti est libertate fugae*** ..."

"In the smiling land of Media,
amid the plains of Sarmatia, and in the level lands
that extend by the Tigris, **the Parthian cannot be conquered by any foe, because he has room for flight.**"

Lentulus chastises Pompey and finds it ridiculous that they enlist the aid of the Parthians, a people not held in such high regard by the Romans (they were generally considered effeminate and unreliable). He sees in this a rather desperate measure on Pompey's part in trying to turn the tide of war in his favor.

Libertas occurs here in two widely different contexts. In the first passage, Lentulus asserts that Pompey is going to war out of love of liberty (*libertatis amor*; 340)—of course Pompey had to go to war in order to stem Caesar's advances (and as Lucan has us know, Caesar is not a fan of Republican *libertas*). With *libertate fugae* is meant the Parthians' opportunity to take flight, due in large part to the lay of the land; perhaps this is why Lentulus is averse to the idea of recruiting the Parthians, mainly because they, according to him, cannot be subdued in their own dominions.

3.2.10 Petreius (IV.212-235)

Next up is Marcus Petreius, a Pompeian general in joint charge of troops in Spain with Afranius. Prior to his speech, Pompeians and Caesarians temporarily reconcile and for a while it looks as though there is full harmony between both camps, only to be brutally quelled by Petreius who puts the enemy faction to the sword. His speech is directed towards his troops.

"inmemor o patriae, signorum oblite tuorum,
non potes hoc causae, miles, praestare, senatus
adsertor uicto redeas ut Caesare? certe,
ut uincare, potes. dum ferrum, incertaque fata,
quique fluat multo non derit uolnere sanguis,
ibitis ad dominum damnataque signa feretis,
utque habeat famulos nullo discrimine Caesar
exorandus erit? ducibus quoque uita petita est?
numquam nostra salus pretium mercesque nefandae
proditionis erit: non hoc ciuilia bella,
ut uiuamus, agunt. trahimur sub nomine pacis.
non chalybem gentes penitus fugiente metallo
eruerent, nulli uallarent oppida muri,

"Soldiers, regardless of your country and forgetful of your standards,
if you cannot, in the cause of the Senate, conquer Caesar and return as liberators, you can at least be conquered for their sake.
While your swords are left and the future is uncertain, and while you have blood enough to flow from many a wound, will you go over to a master and carry the standards which you once condemned?
Must Caesar be implored to treat you no worse than his other slaves?
Have you begged quarter for your generals also?
Never shall our lives be the price and wages of foul treason.
Our life is not the object of civil war.
Under a pretence of peace we are dragged into captivity.
Men would not dig out iron in the deep-burrowing mine,
cities would not be fortified with walls,

non sonipes in bella ferox, non iret in aequor
turrigeras classis pelago sparsura carinas,
si bene libertas umquam pro pace daretur.
hostes nempe meos sceleri iurata nefando
sacramenta tenent; at uobis uilior hoc est
uestra fides, quod pro causa pugnantibus aequa
et ueniam sperare licet. pro dira pudoris
funera! nunc toto fatorum ignarus in orbe,
Magne, paras acies mundique extrema tenentes
sollicitas reges, cum forsan foedere nostro
iam tibi sit promissa salus."

the spirited charger would not rush to battle,
nor the fleet be launched to send turreted ships all over the sea,
if it were ever right to barter freedom for peace.
My foes, it seems, are true to the oath they swore—an oath which binds
them to crimes unspeakable; but you hold your allegiances cheaper,
because you were fighting for a righteous cause and may therefore hope
even for—pardon! Alas! that Honour should die so foul a death.
At this moment Magnus, ignorant of his fate,
is raising armies all over the world and rousing up kings
who inhabit the ends of the earth, though perhaps our treaty
has already bargained for his mere life."

Petreius rebukes them utterly for forsaking their cause, stating quite clearly that their lives are not worth bargaining for, not even in civil war (*numquam nostra salus pretium mercesque nefandae / proditionis erit: non hoc ciuilia bella, / ut uiuamus, agunt*; 220-222). Furthermore, he argues that if liberty is sacrificed in order to achieve peace, then laying down arms is not an option—there is no honor in submitting to Caesar, so his claim goes, because, by securing his pardon, they would in effect be made subservient to him, and no liberty can be had therefrom.

3.2.11 Pompey

Lucan has Pompey deliver two speeches featuring *liber*: the first one is made before his troops not long after Caesar crosses the Rubicon; the second occurs on the eve of Pharsalus. Below are excerpts from both (II.562-566 and VII.369-382, respectively).

SPEECH 1 (II.531-595)

"***quo potuit ciuem populus perducere liber***
ascendi, supraque nihil nisi regna reliqui.
non priuata cupis, Romana quisquis in urbe
Pompeium transire paras. hinc consul uterque,
hinc acies statura ducum est."

"**I have risen as high as a free people could exalt a citizen**,
and above me nothing remains save tyranny.
Whoever schemes to rise above Pompey in the Roman State covets too
much for a mere subject. On my side both consuls will take
their stand, and on my side an army made up of generals."

SPEECH 2 (VII.342-382)

"credite pendentes e summis moenibus urbis
crinibus effusis hortari in proelia matres;
credite grandaeuum uetitumque aetate senatum
arma sequi sacros pedibus prosternere canos
atque ipsam domini metuentem occurrere Romam;
credite qui nunc est populus populumque futurum

"Imagine that the matrons of Rome are hanging over the topmost walls of
the city with dishevelled hair, and urging you to battle;
imagine that aged senators, whose years prevent them from following the
camp, lay at your feet their venerable grey hairs,
and that Rome herself, in her fear of a master, comes to meet you.
Imagine that both generations, the present and the future, address their

permixtas adferre preces: ***haec libera nasci, haec uolt turba mori***. siquis post pignora tanta Pompeio locus est, cum prole et coniuge supplex, imperii salua si maiestate liceret, uoluerer ante pedes. Magnus, nisi uincitis, exul, ludibrium soceri, uester pudor, ultima fata deprecor ac turpes extremi cardinis annos, ne discam seruire senex."

joint entreaties to you: **the one would fain be born, and the other die, in freedom**. If after such solemn appeals there is room for my own name, then, together with my wife and sons, on my knees I would grovel at your feet, if I could do it without sullying the dignity of my command. Unless you conquer, I, Magnus, am an exile, scorned by my kinsman and a disgrace to you, and I pray to escape that utmost misery—shame in the closing years of life, and learning in old age to bear the yoke."

Pompey claims to be fighting for, and striving to uphold, a *libera res publica*; Caesar, according to him, is aiming for greater power and intent on upsetting the status quo to get his way. As Pompey states in the first speech, the consuls and generals are siding with him—his cause is more righteous than Caesar's. Kimmerle notes that *liber* in this case appertains to the rightful Republican order, which can only prevail if the Pompeians win.[63] In the second speech, Pompey exhorts his troops to fight for freedom—in this case, freedom from potential tyranny, which Caesar would bring with him. He mentions that not only his generation, but also the one thereafter, will live to see freedom in their time, but of course, this can only happen if Pompey's side emerges victorious.

3.2.12 Pothinus (VIII.484-535)

Pothinus, speaking to the Pharaoh after learning of Pompey's arrival in Egypt, recommends that Pompey be assassinated (and, indeed, ends up doing the job). The first twelve lines (some of which were used by Bonner in his aforementioned discussion on *partes suadendi*) are presented below.

"ius et fas multos faciunt, Ptolemaee, nocentes; dat poenas laudata fides, cum sustinet" inquit "quos fortuna premit. fatis accede deisque, et cole felices, miseros fuge. sidera terra ut distant et flamma mari, sic utile recto. sceptrorum uis tota perit, si pendere iusta incipit, euertitque arces respectus honesti. ***libertas scelerum est quae regna inuisa tuetur sublatusque modus gladiis.*** facere omnia saeue non inpune licet, nisi cum facis. exeat aula, qui uolt esse pius. uirtus et summa potestas non coeunt; semper metuet quem saeua pudebunt."

He said: "Ptolemy, the laws of God and man make many guilty: we praise loyalty, but it pays the price when it supports those whom Fortune crushes. Take the side of destiny and Heaven, and court the prosperous but shun the afflicted. Expediency is as far from the right as the stars from earth or fire from water. The power of kings is utterly destroyed, once they begin to weigh considerations of justice; and regard for virtue levels the strongholds of tyrants.

It is boundless wickedness and unlimited slaughter that protect the popularity of a sovereign. If all your deeds are cruel, you will suffer for it the moment you cease from cruelty. If a man would be righteous, let him depart from a court. Virtue is incompatible with absolute power. He who is ashamed to commit cruelty must always fear it."

Libertas in this particular instance can be read as a substitute for *licentia*, which has the same primary

[63]Kimmerle 2015: 181-182

meaning but is often used to connote something more negative. *Licentia* occurs four times in Lucan, whereof the first instance occurs as early as Book 1 (*quis furor, o ciues, quae tanta licentia ferri?*; "What madness was this, my countrymen, what fierce orgy of slaughter?"; I.8).[64] It is interesting that Lucan uses *libertas* here to denote something fiercely contrary to the other instances thereof. It could be that metrical purposes forced him to resort to that word, or also that Pothinus himself simply fails to distinguish between *libertas* and *licentia*.

3.2.13 The Massiliots (III.307-355)

The citizens of Massilia, realizing that Caesar might besiege their city, try to bargain with him to let them remain neutral, threatening him with resistance unless he concedes. An extract from their speech follows below.

"si claudere muros		"If you intend to blockade our walls
obsidione paras et ui perfringere portas,		and break down our gates by storm, then we are ready:
excepisse faces tectis et tela parati,		we shall receive firebrands and missiles upon our houses;
undarum raptos auersis fontibus haustus	345	if you divert our springs, we shall dig for a hasty draught of water
quaerere et effossam sitientes lambere terram		and lick with parched tongues the earth we have dug;
et, desit si larga Ceres, tunc horrida cerni		and, if bread run short, then we shall pollute our lips
foedaque contingi maculato attingere morsu.		by gnawing things hideous to see and foul to touch.
nec pauet hic populus pro libertate subire		**In defence of freedom we do not shrink from sufferings that were**
obsessum Poeno gessit quae Marte Saguntum."	350	**bravely borne by Saguntum when beset by the army of Carthage.**"

I agree with Kimmerle that *libertas* here is to be read as the opposite of servitude and subjugation—basically speaking, independence.[65]

3.2.14 Vulteius (IV.476-520)

Vulteius, a Caesarian commander, traveling on a raft with his troops, is caught in a trap devised by Pompey's allies; with the enemy closing in on him from all sides, he encourages everyone on board to commit suicide in order to evade capture. The first twelve lines from his speech are presented below.

[64]Among the definitions of *licentia* as listed in the OLD, we find "immoderate or unruly behaviour, disorderliness, wantonness, licence", and even includes the first of Lucan's four instances under that heading.
[65]Kimmerle 2015: 185

"***libera non ultra parua quam nocte iuuentus***,		"**Soldiers, free for no longer than the brief space of a night**,
consulite extremis angusto in tempore rebus.		use the short interval to decide upon your course in this extremity.
uita breuis nulli superest qui tempus in illa		No life is short that gives a man time to slay himself;
quaerendae sibi mortis habet; nec gloria leti		nor does it lessen the glory of suicide
inferior, iuuenes, admoto occurrere fato.	480	to meet doom at close quarters.
omnibus incerto uenturae tempore uitae		For all men the future of life is uncertain;
par animi laus est et, quos speraueris, annos		and, though it is noble in the mind to forfeit years that you look
perdere et extremae momentum abrumpere lucis,		forward to, it is no less noble to cut short even a moment of
accersas dum fata manu: non cogitur ullus		remaining life, provided that you summon death by your own act.
uelle mori. fuga nulla patet, stant undique nostris	485	No man is forced to die voluntarily. No escape is open to us; our
intenti ciues iugulis: decernite letum,		countrymen surround us, eager for our lives; resolve upon death, and
et metus omnis abest. cupias quodcumque necesse est."		then all fear is dispelled: let a man desire what he cannot avoid."

Here, there is a connection between freedom and death: realizing that he and his men are doomed, Vulteius states that suicide is the only "free" thing they have at their disposal. Rather than falling into enemy hands and being deprived of honor, let alone subjected to servitude, they should resort to whatever freedom they have left: the freedom to die by their own hand.

3.2.15 Summary of speeches made by other characters

In sum, we can see that *libertas* comes in various guises and slants. The Massiliots provide an interesting case in point, seeing that they are the only ones here who have no particular involvement in the Civil War. To them, liberty is independence from a foreign power. In a few other instances, *libertas* denotes something other than "liberty from...": Labienus uses it as a synonym for "opportunity, chance"; in the case of Pothinus, it signifies something wholly inconsistent with Roman law and order. Lentulus uses *libertas* to denote two different things: in the former instance, he speaks about freedom per se and in the latter, he applies it to the Parthians' ability to take flight. To Caesar and Cotta, *libertas* has no value, and Lucan is anxious to convey this clearly to his readers. Cotta, in particular, clearly repudiates *libertas*, claiming it has no place in a potential tyranny. To Petreius, *libertas* is preferable to peace since it enables Rome to be better off, as exemplified by the four instances he provides in his speech (223-226). Cornelia herself seems to have no opinion of her own regarding *libertas*; she mainly serves as Pompey's mouthpiece here.

As regards *liber*, its usage is manifold. Brutus claims that only Caesar would be left "free" when all comes around (as in, Caesar is the only one who need not resort to others in order to pursue his agenda). Domitius states that he will die a "free" man (i.e., he has divested himself of any earthly burdens). Figulus proclaims that Rome can only be "free" as long as war rages (i.e., the war prevents

tyranny from taking root). Cleopatra reports that Ptolemy is not "free" to love her, since he is Pothinus' marionette. Caesar wishes for his troops to be "free" so that they can conquer on his behalf. Vulteius realizes that he and his men will risk capture and concludes that suicide is their only "free" option. When Cornelia says that she is not *libera culpa bellorum*, she is basically saying that she is "enslaved" to the war effort on account of her being Pompey's wife.

Pompey is portrayed as a self-proclaimed champion of *libertas*, yet his approach towards liberty is greatly biased, tailor-made to suit his own views. This is in clear contrast to Cato, whose take on *libertas* is more in line with Republican order. Cato, whose foremost allegiance lay with the Republic, thus represents *libertas* in its purest form. Had Pompey claimed *libertas* for his own, it would not have had the same repute as per Lucan. Pompey may be more noble than Caesar, but he aspired to the same position as his rival, and to Lucan, *libertas* and *regnum* are not an ideal match.

In the next chapter I will take a closer look at how Cato, Caesar, Pompey, and even Lucan himself perceive *libertas*.

4. Discussion

As was shown in the previous chapter, a lot can be deduced from *libertas*, everything from freedom per se to its use as a synonym for "opportunity" and "licence" (of a more negative kind), and, as has been stated earlier, it has come to mean different things to different people, depending on not only their political background but also the situation in question. In §4.1 I shall discuss *libertas* as approached by Caesar, Pompey, and Cato within the framework of *Bellum Civile*; §4.2 deals with how Lucan himself regarded *libertas*.

4.1 *Libertas* according to Caesar, Pompey, and Cato

Here I shall take a closer look at the characters of not just Cato but also his political adversaries Caesar and Pompey as portrayed by Lucan vis-à-vis their outlooks on *libertas*. What message does Lucan seek to convey to his readers, and furthermore, are his portrayals of especially Caesar and Pompey by any means justifiable?

4.1.1 Caesar

It goes without saying that Lucan was not particularly fond of Caesar and sought to brand him a villain of the highest degree. To him, Caesar clearly has not the Republic's interests at heart and is intent on establishing a new order, having no qualms about overturning long-established precepts. Brutus in particular is portrayed as being perceptive enough to know that Caesar's machinations would enable him to be the only free man standing in the end, as he states rather bluntly in his conversation with Cato. By enjoying the support of the plebs, Caesar was confident enough to satisfy himself with the notion that he would be able to prevail.

In the second of his speeches dealt with in the previous chapter, Caesar wishes for his troops to be a *libera turba*. This particular choice of wording is indicative of his desire to obtain absolute victory; once his soldiers are declared "free", they basically have his blessing to wreak as much havoc on their opponents as they please. They effectively serve as his extended hand. That Caesar expresses a wish to return to the life of a private person is a clear sign that Lucan aims to portray him as a hypocrite.

Kimmerle states that Caesar, unlike Pompey, never sought to lay claim on freedom in the sense of rightful Republican order, further stating that Lucan's Caesar resembles its historical counterpart.[66]

Seen against this background, *libertas* basically means nothing to Caesar—there is no point in his embracing it if Lucan intends to equate that word with the Republic at large. Indeed, Lucan states quite pointedly that the Civil War itself, especially after Pharsalus, became a struggle between Caesar and *libertas* (VII.689-697):

fuge proelia dira		Let him flee from the fatal field,
ac testare deos nullum, qui perstet in armis,	690	and call Heaven to witness that those who continue the fight are no longer
iam tibi, Magne, mori. ceu flebilis Africa damnis		giving their lives for Pompey. Like the woeful losses in Africa,
et ceu Munda nocens Pharioque a gurgite clades,		like guilty Munda and the slaughter by the Nile,
sic et Thessalicae post te pars maxima pugnae		so most of the fighting at Pharsalia, after Pompey's departure,
non iam Pompei nomen populare per orbem		ceased to represent the world's love of Pompey or the passion for war:
nec studium belli, ***sed par quod semper habemus,***	695	**it was the never-ending contest between Freedom and Empire**:
Libertas et Caesar, erit; teque inde fugato		and when Pompey had fled from Pharsalia,
ostendit moriens sibi se pugnasse senatus.		the senators proved by dying that they had fought in their own quarrel.

4.1.2 Pompey

Pompey, who has at his disposal the support of the majority of the Senate, considers himself a champion of *libertas* as per Lucan. At the start of his first speech, delivered not long after Caesar crossed the Rubicon, he addresses his men as *o scelerum ultores melioraque signa secuti, / o uere Romana manus, quibus arma senatus / non priuata dedit* ("avengers of crime and followers of the rightful standards, Romans indeed, whom the Senate has armed to defend your country"; II.531-533), eager to let them know that the Pompeian side is the righteous and legitimate one as opposed to the Caesarian; furthermore, Pompey even lets himself entertain the notion that Caesar will certainly be vanquished (*sternere profecto*; 546). He is convinced that Caesar will attempt to quash any vestige of freedom, and is therefore keen on letting it be known that he himself is fighting on behalf of *libertas*. Unfortunately, his words fall on unenthusiastic ears since his supporters are beset by impending fear—apparently Caesar was too big a threat for them to take on at the moment, judging by Lucan's wording: *placuitque referri / signa nec in tantae discrimina mittere pugnae / iam uictum fama non uisi Caesaris agmen* ("and it was decided to recall the standards, rather than expose to the hazard of a decisive engagement an army already beaten by the rumour of Caesar before they saw him"; 598-600)

[66]Kimmerle 2015: 194; ibid. n.126

—thereby compelling him to seek refuge in Brundisium.

Lebek singles out the phrase *populus liber* in particular and ponders over whether it is to be considered reality or merely propaganda. Pompey claims that he has managed to attain his position without even having dented whatever freedom Rome enjoyed thus far. Lebek states that Pompey is here vague about what his ulterior motive is, and senses that his words are suggestive of hypocrisy.[67] Pompey realizes that, in order for him to be considered a champion of *libertas*, he must be seen as embracing the Republican cause outright; he wants his fellow Romans to know that he is not (like) Caesar. He can therefore not allow himself to openly express his innermost desires.

In the second speech, Pompey, speaking with more confidence now that he has managed to muster a more stable and formidable army, addresses his men on the eve of the battle that changed the fortunes of Rome utterly. What is particularly remarkable about this speech is that he also utters the words *libera turba*, just like Caesar did only 111 verses earlier, yet with a subtext that differs considerably from that of Caesar. In Caesar's mouth, it indicates something perverse and uncouth, whereas in Pompey's, it is more in line with Republican interests.[68] Having been mandated by the Senate to represent Republican law and order, he exhorts his listeners to imagine all generations of Romans, whether present or future, living in freedom. He seeks to instill them with optimism and full belief in his cause, thereby having them believe that they are the rightful guardians of *libertas*. He concludes his speech by stating expressly that if they lose, he would be consigned to exile and rendered an object of scorn and disgrace (VII.379-382); it is therefore crucial that they win, otherwise both Rome and freedom as they know it would land in peril. Furthermore, Lebek states that Pompey here acts as Lucan's mouthpiece, arguing that his mindset mirrors that of Lucan.[69]

4.1.3 Cato

Cato, despite playing a rather secondary role in not just the epic but also the Civil War itself, nevertheless exerts a presence bordering on tangible. Lucan considers him the one leader whom others ought to follow and emulate, given his devotion to selfless causes, in this case fighting for the sake of

[67]Lebek 1976: 194
[68]ibid. 236
[69]ibid. 237

upholding the old Republican order. Unlike Caesar and Pompey, Cato does not wish to seek any personal gain—he likes to think of himself as a servant, with Rome as his mistress. Whereas Brutus would prefer him to keep a low profile and not sully his reputation any further, Cato argues that such action would be unbecoming to anyone who not only perceives but actually sees and bears witness to the Republic's being under threat. Whereas Labienus urges him to consult the oracle to learn of the outcome of the war, Cato states that he is in principle above such actions.

It has already been stated that Cato's grasp on *libertas* differs in a few ways. When he first mentions it, he treats it as though it were someone who has seen better days—at the time of speaking, this character he calls Libertas has been rendered a spectral wretch with an empty shadow. Lucan seems to portray Cato in this instance as someone who is pretty much convinced that freedom has been swept away with the onset of war; if anything, this particular Libertas could possibly represent the original freedom that came with the establishment of the Republic back in 509 BCE.

When Cato gives his funeral oration, he first gives credit to Pompey for allowing freedom to prevail in the Senate, then he states that there are two kinds of belief in freedom (*vera* and *ficta fides libertatis*); the former vanished already some forty years before the main events, referring to an earlier civil war in which Pompey played a rather objectionable part—history records him as being an *adulescentulus carnifex* (teenage butcher)—and the latter lingered on until Pompey's death. Either Cato is contradicting himself here or he has in mind various shades of *libertas*: senatorial as has already been determined; as regards *fides libertatis*, it could possibly refer to the status of the common people themselves. Cato might perhaps have regarded the plebs as being "enslaved" in the sense that their civic rights were pretty much limited, even though they were not technically slaves.

In the third speech, where Cato speaks of *libertas*, he has in mind a kind of freedom not altogether evident in any of his previous speeches. Senatorial freedom has now become severely jeopardized and Cato knows this; the freedom he refers to here is the one inherent in each and every one of them as individuals. He wants to make it clear that he alone represents *libertas*, and when he derides his audience for wanting to forsake his cause and submit to Caesar, he is clearly not playing games. Despite the odds' not being directly favorable, Cato is nonetheless determined to check Caesar as best he can.

4.1.4 Summary

We have now dealt with three characters with clearly different personalities and equally conflicting views on *libertas*. Caesar's view is, as Lucan is determined to have us know, utterly inconsistent with and repugnant to *libertas* as he knows it. Cato and Pompey are the foremost contenders, yet they disagree on how to approach *libertas*. Pompey attempts to pursue his agenda in the guise of *libertas*, and since he is endorsed by the Senate, one could easily forgive him for "hijacking" the word to suit his own needs. As much as Pompey claims to represent the Republican cause, Lucan, if anyone, certainly knew better. When Caesar and Pompey speak of freedom in general, they are intentionally opaque since they cannot risk laying bare their true intentions.

Cato, on the other hand, has a rather ambivalent attitude towards *libertas*, depending largely on which nuance is meant. When he talks about freedom enjoyed by the Senate in particular, he is convinced that there is none to speak of in that regard, what with Rome being embroiled in a war waged between two opposing generals who both seek to impose a *regnum*. Cato is more receptive towards the idea of personal freedom, where the individual citizen is free to choose his own course of action, provided he has the status of a free man. Since the historical Cato had this privilege, he could therefore have been able to practice *libertas* the way he saw fit, even if it stood in sharp contrast with how others understood the term.

One thing Cato and Pompey have in common here is that in their respective speeches they seem to mention things that reflect Lucan's own mindset, according to Lebek, who, as stated earlier, claims that the last lines in Pompey's second speech echo Lucan's sentiments. One example regarding Cato can be found at the end of his first speech, where he lays bare Pompey's true intentions, and Lebek argues that those words could very well have been spoken by Lucan himself.[70]

As a further point of observation, Lucan confers various epithets upon Cato (*durus, sanctus, invictus, securus, maestus*). They are presented below in context.

durus — *hi mores, haec **duri** inmota Catonis / secta fuit* ("such was the character, such the inflexible rule of austere Cato"; II.380-381)

[70]Lebek 1976: 194

	*et mala uel **duri** lacrimas motura Catonis* (“and with a sorrow that might draw tears even from stern Cato”; IX.50)
sanctus	*nec **sancto** caruisset uita Catone* (“nor would the land of the living have lost the stainless Cato”; VI.311)
	*nam cui crediderim superos arcana daturos / dicturosque magis, quam **sancto**, uera, Catoni?* (“I cannot believe that Heaven would reveal mysteries and proclaim truth to any man more than to the pure and holy Cato”; IX.554-555)
invictus	*et **inuicti** posuit se mente Catonis* (“and took up its abode in the heart of unconquerable Cato”; IX.18)
securus	*inuasit Libye **securi** fata Catonis* (“for Africa ... laid hold upon the last days of Cato, but Cato cared not”; IX.410)
maestus	*non decus imperii, non **maesti** iura Catonis* (“neither national pride nor the authority of grief-stricken Cato”; IX.747)

What can be deduced from these? Pretty much anyone who has studied Cato would undoubtedly agree that *durus* would be most fitting if one had to describe him using just one word. *Maestus* fits in well too, since Cato could be considered as mourning over what had become of Rome; to fully symbolize this, he let his hair and beard grow long, and stopped reclining at tables, preferring to sit upright like a slave.[71] *Sanctus* and especially *invictus* should be dealt with caution; it is easy to accuse Lucan of submitting to hyperbole when appraising his depiction of Cato. Yet then again, Lucan may be telling us something that is not altogether obvious; by referring to Cato as *sanctus*, he wants to make it clear that he holds Cato in high esteem, regardless of whatever fault he may have committed (on an interesting note, the second instance of *sanctus* is uttered by Labienus, giving the impression that Cato was, if not revered, then at least held in high regard among his contemporaries). *Invictus* can be considered Lucan’s way of saying that Cato cannot be overcome—he may not be as popular or beloved as Caesar, but he is still worthy of reverence.

Lucan has Caesar refer to Cato (in the corresponding plural form *Catones*) as *nomina vana* (“that empty name”; I.313)—a clear indication of animosity. It should be said that Caesar authored an *Anti-Cato* in response to a series of pamphlets in praise of Cato written after his death. The real Caesar would undoubtedly have made a similar statement as Lucan’s Caesar, whether sincerely or in jest.

[71]Goodman & Soni 2012: 249-250

4.2 *Libertas* according to Lucan

In *Bellum Civile*, *libertas* represents, among other things, the Republican forces led by Cato at the point where Lucan writes that the Civil War has, following Pompey's assassination, become a struggle between tyranny (Caesar) and freedom (Cato). Martindale makes the following observation: "*Libertas* in the *Bellum Civile* is sometimes the Republican constitution and sometimes the spiritual freedom that the *sapiens*, in Lucan's somewhat pessimistic version of Stoicism, alone can achieve, as a last resort if necessary by suicide. The two concepts meet in the figure of Cato, and it may be felt that the freedom of the mind is even more important to Lucan than the freedom of the state."[72]

Tucker notes that, of the 30 instances of *libertas* occurring throughout the poem, "[t]he twenty-six occurrences of the word *libertas* which may be translated as 'liberty' in the sense of freedom from tyranny or political oppression fall into two main categories: quotations put by Lucan into the mouths of various characters in the epic and Lucan's own editorial comments. The latter may be further divided into comments that are related to specific persons mentioned in the narrative and comments of a more general nature."[73]

Lucan states that the turning point came with Pharsalus, whose aftermath had a drastic impact on the state of affairs. *Libertas,* once a given in Republican days, has now been rendered merely an illusion, a reminder of a bygone era, nothing short of an ideal in the eyes of Lucan. Lucan's Cato is aware that *libertas* is under threat even before he joins in the fray; furthermore, he is reluctant to admit that it has been extinguished wholesale—as long as there is resistance, no matter how minute, there is still hope for it. Even though Cato fought for something he considered righteous, he still lost, and hence *libertas* has come to denote something negative since it was ultimately associated with the losing side. Pre-Pharsalus *libertas* is, in the eyes of Lucan, something concrete and tangible, while post-Pharsalus *libertas* has been rendered abstract and illusory, nothing more than a relic of a very recent past. Kimmerle goes so far as to claim that Pompey tried to appropriate the restoration of *libertas* in case of victory, and that Cato seemed to champion a form of *libertas* that was irretrievable.[74]

[72]Martindale 1984: 71
[73]Tucker 1977: 82
[74]Kimmerle 2015: 211

5. Conclusion

As shown on p. 7, *libertas* can be defined in several ways. We have seen Lucan putting that word into the mouths of diverse characters, in various contexts, most notably Pothinus when advising the Pharaoh on how to deal with Pompey's impending arrival (VIII.491), Labienus when imploring Cato to consult the oracle (IX.558), and Lentulus when rebuking Pompey for wanting to enlist the aid of the Parthians (VIII.340, 371). Lentulus is one of few characters to utter the word more than once and each time he does so it occurs in different contexts: firstly when arguing that Pompey is fighting "out of love for freedom" (Pompey in fact aims to thwart Caesar's potential schemes); and secondly when talking about how the Parthians' homeland is constituted such that they are able to seek refuge with ease. When Caesar and Pompey utter the words *libertas* and *liber*, they tend to be used whenever they want to mask their real intentions. Both are eager to appeal to the populace by masquerading as defenders of a freedom that is at odds with how it has been regarded by the Republic in general and the Senate in particular. Lucan was clearly intent on portraying Caesar especially as a hypocrite, whereas Pompey is given a more humane treatment—in some passages he is referred to by his cognomen Magnus, meaning "great", though it should not be taken as proof that Lucan approved of him wholesale.

Every time Cato speaks of *libertas*, it seems to shift meaning. Perhaps this was intended by Lucan, who was undoubtedly aware of the many facets pertaining to the word itself. Could it be safe to infer that Lucan was convinced that Cato was the one who knew about the intricacies of *libertas* best? Cato is in fact the only character in the poem to liken *libertas* to a physical/spiritual being simply by using the vocative, the case of address, which should clearly amount to something, or so Lucan has us believe. It has been established that *salva libertate* (IX.192-193) refers to the freedom enjoyed by the Senate under Pompey's rule, and with *cum prope libertas* (IX.265) he has in mind a freedom whereof he himself seems to be aware, unlike his audience. It is clearly no secret that Lucan idolized Cato; since Cato would not give up his beloved Republic without a fight, he if anyone clearly must have known what it felt like to fight for freedom, especially freedom from tyranny, and perhaps this is why Lucan has him approach *libertas* from different angles more so than the other characters.

I began my investigation by posing the following research questions, which are repeated below:

1) Which particular shade of *libertas* is meant in a given context?
2) What can be inferred from Cato's view on *libertas* as appears in the poem?
3) What can be inferred from how the author himself broaches the subject?

The first question was addressed by analyzing the speeches in Chapter 3, where I discovered that there are several shades of *libertas* being posed, of which some examples have been provided on the previous page. Some of the other characters, especially those who mention the adjective *liber* only (Cleopatra, Domitius, Figulus, Vulteius), talk generally about freedom per se without elaborating thereon any further.

As regards the second question, it has been established that Cato is here portrayed as someone whose perception of *libertas* differs considerably from the rest. First time he speaks thereof (II.303) he views it as an entity who has seen better days (as exemplified by his use of *inanis umbra*), a spent force with no foreseeable future. The second instance (IX.193, 205) occurs when he eulogizes Pompey, where he stresses that Pompey allowed for freedom to flourish during his reign, yet then he goes on to state that common belief in freedom had perished some four decades prior. In the third speech concerned (IX. 265), he seems to have acknowledged that there is no political freedom to speak of, and therefore opts for personal freedom, a freedom that he presents for his audience as something they can gain provided that they join him. Seen as a whole, Cato offers various nuances on *libertas* that present themselves as, if not contradictory, then certainly convoluted.

And as for the third question: Lucan, due to his Republican leanings, came to equate *libertas* with Cato more than any other, and consequently his take on *libertas* exudes an air of unmistakable Republicanism. We must not forget that he saw the Civil War as a contest between Caesar and *libertas*, and with this he clearly entails freedom from tyranny. We could even ask ourselves this: Is Lucan being fair towards Cato by portraying him the way he does in *Bellum Civile*? Given that the historical Cato's views regarding *libertas* have not been preserved (indeed, the only piece of writing we have from him is a letter he wrote to Cicero)[75], it thus makes it difficult to pinpoint how he himself would have interpreted it. Considering that he was a staunch constitutionalist, one would be inclined to

[75]Cicero, *Epistulae ad Familiares* XV.5

believe that he would have subscribed to the common perception of what constituted "freedom" in a political sense in his day, or at least according to how the *optimates* viewed it.

Aside from Wirszubski's interpretations (1950: 4-5), I should add that *libertas*, as it appears in Lucan, can also be interpreted in the following ways:

(1) freedom from tyranny;
(2) freedom to act against tyranny;
(3) an alternative name for the Republic itself.

Wirszubski mentions Lucan in passing and acknowledges that there was a conflict between *libertas* and Principate by stating thusly: "But while the conflict between the Principate and *libertas* under the emperors from Tiberius to Domitian appears to have been a fact, it is by no means clear what was the nature of that conflict. The real issue is somewhat obscured, for the modern student at least, by the ambiguity of the relevant political terms, above all *libertas* itself. *Libertas* means either personal and civic rights, or republicanism, or both, and, while under each of these heads fall several cognate but distinct notions, it is not always easy to ascertain exactly what *libertas* means in each particular instance."[76] Cato, of course, had the liberty to make a stand against the impending tyranny of Caesar, which was certainly not lost on Lucan.

Lebek and Kimmerle both have very strong points of argument, yet it is very hard to posit which of them purports to "know" Lucan, not just as an author but as a private person, best. Kimmerle seems keen on separating Lucan from the "narrator", giving the impression that the contents of the poem do not represent Lucan's own thoughts. If she is spot-on, then we cannot even know with certainty how Lucan would have regarded Cato, and subsequently any thoughts that Cato has of *libertas* would be greatly compromised. It should be stated that Roman poets tended to use the first-person plural in their works for part aesthetic, part convenient, part metrical reasons (*canimus*, I.2; *habemus*, VII.695); perhaps Lucan did not want to place too much attention on himself on his part, considering that he was dealing with a topic that did not exactly suit the order of the day.

Is it fair to say that the "narrator" is not Lucan himself? I myself am of the opinion that some of the

[76]Wirszubski 1950: 125

contents are of a rather personal nature, and any tendency to dissociate Lucan from the general narrative strikes me as somewhat far-fetched. Lucan's apostrophe towards Cato (IX.695-704; presented on p. 6 in this paper), in particular, strikes me as an indication of Lucan's personal sentiments. Of course, there were quite a few even in Lucan's time who did admire Cato, including Seneca, who has dwelt upon him on numerous occasions in his own works, yet none of them were as fervent as Lucan. Seneca tended to extol Cato through a Stoic lens, yet claimed that his ideals were not fitting for the times. Lucan took it one step further, by attempting to portray Cato as an exemplary role model for others to follow. As Lucan saw it, Cato was the ultimate champion of *libertas*.

* * *

> "In a society dominated by men who were the extreme opposites of the Republican hero, it is not surprising that Cato was deified by an idealistic young poet such as Lucan. For the real antithesis of Cato is not so much Julius Caesar, whose greatness, in the *Bellum Ciuile*, constantly shines through the dark clouds of Lucan's disapproval, but the living Caesar—Nero himself. Confronted by the fact of Nero—his character, his associates, his awesome power—it is not surprising that Lucan went to extremes in his adulation of Cato."
>
> —Goar 1987: 48

Much has happened between 48 BCE and 65 CE. By the time Lucan started composing his epic, the Republic, governed by two consuls who were elected on a one-year basis, had long since given way to a Principate helmed by successive emperors, Nero being the fifth. With each new emperor, *libertas* as it was known was diminished piecemeal until it had become nothing more than a memory of yesteryear. As much as Augustus may have claimed to have rehabilitated *libertas*, things were no longer the same; when Nero ascended the throne, there was virtually no *libertas* to think of. Indeed, we could even ask ourselves if Lucan was doing his contemporaries a favor by writing about an event that to some people was still a very touchy subject. Furthermore, was he perspicacious enough to know that he might risk his life especially by elevating the man whose name became synonymous with the Republic and likening him to an idol? Given that he adhered to the same school of philosophy as Cato, one might even add that the poem is a thinly veiled protest against the status quo; Lucan was clearly adamant that a calamity the likes of the Battle of Pharsalus must never be forgotten.

As much as Lucan did harbor Republican sympathies, he, like so many others, would have had to acknowledge that the Republic was by then a spent force. Moreover, the problem he had with the

Principate was nothing but the *princeps* himself, against whom he bore a grudge ever since Nero had banned him from reciting his works in public. Tacitus writes in *Annales* XV.45.3 that Lucan's motive for joining the Pisonian conspiracy was strictly personal, not political (*Lucanum propriae causae accendebant*).

Cato's popularity during the Principate was mixed at best. Some emperors were more tolerant of his legacy than others. Yet writers, especially Seneca, had a tendency to focus more on Cato the Stoic sage rather than Cato the statesman, effectively reducing him to a one-dimensional figure. Even the Stoic Opposition did not have as their ulterior motive the restoration of the Republic—all they wanted was the instatement of a *princeps* who would be more tolerant and respectful of the ways of yore, *libertas* included, yet still maintain the current system of government.

Even though Lucan was eager to present Cato as the ultimate champion of *libertas*, there is really no way to answer the question whether his putting words in Cato's mouth makes Lucan any more credible as an authority on him; as much as he may serve to portray Cato in a favorable light, one must be wary of attaching any semblance of authenticity to Lucan's choice of wording, given that poets in particular are sometimes inclined to resort to artistic licence. W.R. Johnson goes so far as to claim that Lucan's overall portrayal of Cato is, if anything, more like a caricature:

> In short, what is troublesome about Lucan's Cato (who perhaps resembles his imitators in Lucan's day) is his puritanical extravagance, his unfailing inhumanity. Even if we allow for the possibility that Lucan felt the need to exaggerate this excess (in order, say, to balance the contrary excesses of his Caesar), we are left with the sense that Lucan, in part unconsciously and unwillingly, found himself caricaturing an outworm [*sic.*] ideal, a paradigm of human action and human excellence which came at last to seem to him deficient, unreal.[77]

If that really is the case, then one could easily question Cato's views on *libertas* as to their degree of sincerity. Since Lucan has Cicero appear on the battlefield (VII.62-85), which in itself is a historical inaccuracy, would it be fair to dismiss Cato's speeches as a collection of merely empty words, just like Cato himself admits that *libertas* possesses an empty shade? The reader must ultimately be aware that all the speeches in *Bellum Civile* derive from Lucan's own hand, and he could very well have manipulated events and actions to suit his fancy, as in the case with Cicero, yet as regards Lucan's

[77]Johnson 1987: 37-38

depiction of Cato, it is not my place to say if Johnson's assessment is accurate.

It could even be said that Lucan favors Cato simply because they were both adherents of Stoicism, and if that were the case, one could easily accuse Lucan of being subjective. Yet, since Cato's contemporaries would in all likelihood have agreed that he could be considered *durus*, such a claim would be rather unfair. After all, Cato was pretty much a principled, no-nonsense politician who simply wanted to serve Rome as best he could, hoping that would set an example; ergo, Lucan's choice of wording, as exemplified by the five adjectives presented on pp. 45-46, is fully justifiable.

Those who were convinced that *libertas* suffered no damage to its name as the Republic transitioned into a Principate would undoubtedly have failed to curry any favor whatsoever with someone like Lucan. It should be said that any autocracy, no matter how benevolent it purports to be, barely allows for freedom of any kind, and Lucan must have sensed this more than most. And so by penning an epic about the beginning of the end of the Republic, he did something truly revolutionary. Caesar may have gained the upper hand after Pharsalus and emerged as the only free man standing as the Republic drew its final breath, yet not even freedom could keep him from being assassinated. Cato, who had the misfortune of representing the side that ultimately lost, had, on the other hand, the liberty to not only make a stand against Caesar, but also take his own life, which makes him the "winner" in that sense.

Bibliography

Primary literature:

Cicero. *Epistulae ad Atticum*

—*Epistulae ad Familiares*

—*Pro Murena*

Lucanus. *Belli Civilis libri decem* (ed. A.E. Housman, 1926). Oxford: Basil Blackwell

—*De Bello Civili* (trans. James Duff Duff, 1928). London: William Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons

Persius. *Satires* (trans. John Conington, 1872). Oxford: Clarendon

Ploutarchos. *Life of Cato the Younger (Bíoi Parállēloi #8*)

Quintilianus. *Institutio Oratoria* (trans. Harold Edgeworth Butler, 1920-22). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann

Sallustius. *De coniuratione Catilinae* (trans. John Carew Rolfe, 1921). London: William Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons

Tacitus. *Annales*

Secondary literature:

Ahl, Frederick M. "The Pivot of the Pharsalia" (1974), Hermes 102 #2:305-320

—"The Shadows of a Divine Presence in the Pharsalia" (1974), Hermes 102 #4:566-590

—*Lucan: An Introduction* (1976). Ithaca: Cornell University Press

—"Form Empowered: Lucan's *Pharsalia*"; *Roman Epic* (ed. Anthony James Boyle), 125-142 (1993). Routledge: London & New York

Arena, Valentina. *'Libertas' and the Practice of Politics in the Late Roman Republic* (2012). Cambridge University Press

Bexley, Erica M. "The myth of the republic: Medusa and Cato in Lucan, *Pharsalia 9*"; *Lucan's "Bellum Civile" between epic tradition and aesthetic innovation* (eds. N. Hömke & C. Reitz), 135-153 (2010). Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter

Bleicken, Jochen. *Staatliche Ordnung und Freiheit in der römischen Republik* (1972). Kallmünz: Lassleben

Bonner, Stanley F. "Lucan and the Declamation Schools" (1966), The American Journal of Philology 87 #3:257-289

Brunt, Peter Astbury. *The Fall of the Roman Republic* (1988). Oxford: Clarendon

Crutchfield, Matthew Dale. *A New Heroism: A Study of Battle Scenes in Lucan's* Bellum Civile (diss.) (2015). University of Missouri Columbia

Dilke, O.A.W. "Lucan's Political Views and the Caesars"; *Neronians and Flavians: Silver Latin I* (ed. D.R. Dudley), 62-82 (1972). London: Routledge

Drogula, Fred K. *Cato the Younger: Life and Death at the End of the Roman Republic* (2019). Oxford University Press

George, David B. “Lucan’s Cato and Stoic Attitudes to the Republic” (1991), Classical Antiquity 10:237-258
Goar, Robert J. *The Legend of Cato Uticensis from the First Century B.C. to the Fifth Century A.D.: With an Appendix on Dante and Cato* (1987). Collection Latomus #197. Brussels: Latomus
Goodman, Rob & Soni, Jimmy. *Rome’s Last Citizen: The Life and Legacy of Cato, Mortal Enemy of Caesar* (2012). New York: Thomas Dunne Books
Gowing, Alain M. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture* (2005). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Haffter, Heinz. “Dem schwanken Zünglein lauschend wachte Cäsar dort” (1957), Museum Helveticum 14, Fasc. 2:118-126
Jaeger, Muriel. *Experimental Lives: From Cato to George Sand* (1932). London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd.
Johnson, Walter Ralph. *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and his Heroes* (1987). Ithaca: Cornell University Press
Kimmerle, Nadja. *Lucan und der Prinzipat: Inkonsistenz und unzuverlässiges Erzählen im Bellum Civile* (2015). De Gruyter
Kloesel, Hans. *Libertas* (diss.) (1935). Breslau
Lebek, Wolfgang Dieter. *Lucans Pharsalia: Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug* (1976). Hypomnemata #44. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
Lind, L.R. “The Idea of the Republic and the Foundations of Roman Political Liberty”; *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IV* (ed. Carl Deroux), 44-108 (1986). Collection Latomus #196. Brussels: Latomus
Lintott, Andrew W. “Lucan and the History of Civil War” (1971), The Classical Quarterly 21 #2:488-505
Mackie, Nicola K. “*Res publica restituta*: A Roman Myth”; *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IV* (ed. Deroux), 302-340 (1986). Collection Latomus #196. Brussels: Latomus
Martindale, Charles. “The Politician Lucan” (1984), Greece & Rome 31 #1:64-79
Masters, Jaime. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan’s Bellum Civile* (1992). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Nutting, Herbert C. “The Hero of the Pharsalia” (1932), The American Journal of Philology 53 #1:41-52
Pavan, Massimiliano. “L’ideale politico di Lucano” (1954/55), Atti dell’Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti 113, Classe di scienze morali e lettere:209-222
Rolim de Moura, Alessandro. “Cato in Libya (Lucan 9)” (2010), Letras Clássicas 14:63-91
Seo, J. Mira. “Lucan’s Cato and the Poetics of Exemplarity”; *Brill’s Companion to Lucan* (ed. Paolo Asso), 199-221 (2011). Leiden & Boston
Sklenář, Robert J. *The Taste for Nothingness: A Study of* Virtus *and Related Themes in Lucan’s* Bellum Civile (2003). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
Snell, Antony. “Lucan” (1939), Greece & Rome 8 #23:83-91
Stover, Tim. “Cato and the Intended Scope of Lucan’s ‘Bellum Civile’” (2008), The Classical Quarterly 58 #2:571-580

Thorne, Mark Allen. *Lucan's Cato, The Defeat of Victory, The Triumph of Memory* (diss.) (2010). University of Iowa

Tucker, Robert A. "Lucan and *Libertas*" (1977), The Classical Bulletin 53:81-85

Webster, Edwin White. *Virtus and Libertas: The Ideals and Spirit of the Roman Senatorial Aristocracy from the Punic Wars through the Time of Augustus* (diss.) (1936): University of Chicago

Wirszubski, Chaim. *Libertas As a Political Idea at Rome During the Late Republic and Early Principate* (1950). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Appendix

Below follows a full overview of all the speeches in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*. The ones in boldface indicate those that feature the words "liber"/"libertas".

Book I (181/695)

imago patriae	190-192
Caesar	195-203, 225-227
Ariminenses	248-257
Curio	273-291
Caesar	299-351
Laelius	359-386
Arruns	631-637
Figulus	**641-672**
matrona I	678-694

Book II (387/736)

matrona II	38-42
viri	45-63
parens	68-232
Brutus	**242-284**
Cato	**286-323**
Marcia	338-349
Domitius	483-490
Caesar	494-499, 512-515
Domitius	522-525
Pompeius	**531-595**, 632-648

Book III (140/762)

Iulia	12-34
Pompeius	38-40
Caesar	91-97
Metellus	123-133
Caesar	**134-140**
Cotta	**145-152**
Massiliotes	**307-355**
Caesar	358-372, 436-437
Brutus	559-561
Tyrrhenus	716-721
pater Argi	742-747

Book IV (171/824)

Caesar	162-166
Petreius	**212-235**
Caesar	273-280
Afranius	344-362
Vulteius	**476-520**, 542-544
incola Libycus	593-660
Curio	702-710

Book V (288/815)

Lentulus	17-47
Phemonoë	130-140
Appius	158-161
Apollo (via Ph.)	194-196
miles Caesaris	261-295
Caesar	319-364, 413-423, 481-497
Amyclas	521-523
Caesar	532-537
Amyclas	540-559, 568-576
Caesar	578-593, 654-671
castra Caesaris	682-699
Pompeius	739-759
Cornelia	762-790

Book VI (181/829)

Scaeva	150-165, 230-235, 241-246
Pompeius	319-329
Sextus Pompeius	589-603
Erictho	605-623, 659-666, 695-718, 730-749, 762-774
cadaver	777-820

Book VII (206/867)

Cicero	68-85
Pompeius	87-123
C. Cornelius	195-196
Caesar	**250-329**
Pompeius	**342-382**
Caesar	606-607
Domitius	**610-615**
Pompeius	659-666, 720-721
Caesar	737-746

Book VIII (472/872)

Pompeius	72-85
Cornelia	88-105
Mytilenaei	110-127
Pompeius	129-146
rector puppis	172-186
Pompeius	187-192
Deiotarus	211-238
Pompeius	262-327
Lentulus	**331-453**
Pothinus	**484-535**
Pompeius	579-582
Cornelia	584-589
Pompeius	622-635
Cornelia	**639-661**
Cordus	729-742, 746-751, 759-775

Book IX (350/1107)

Cornelia	**55-108**
Gnaeus Pom.	123-125
Sextus Pom.	126-145
Gnaeus Pom.	148-164
Cato	**190-214**, 222-224
Cilix	227-251
Cato	**256-283**, 379-406, 505-509
Labienus	**550-563**
Cato	**566-584**, 612-616
milites Catonis	848-880
monstrator Caesaris	979
Caesar	990-999, 1014-1032, 1064-1104

Book X (210/545)

Cleopatra	**85-103**
Caesar	176-192
Acoreus	194-331
Pothinus	353-398