Landscapes of War in Greek and Roman Literature

Edited by Bettina Reitz-Joosse,
Marian W. Makins and C. J. Mackie

BLOOMSBURY

OPEN ACCESS

LANDSCAPES OF WAR IN GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE

Also available from Bloomsbury

LUCAN'S IMPERIAL WORLD
edited by Laura Zientek and Mark Thorne

WAR AND PEACE IN THE WESTERN POLITICAL IMAGINATION
by Roger B. Manning

WAR AS SPECTACLE
edited by Anastasia Bakogianni and Valerie M. Hope

LANDSCAPES OF WAR IN GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE

Edited by Bettina Reitz-Joosse, Marian W. Makins and C. J. Mackie

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA
29 Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2, Ireland

BLOOMSBURY, BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC and the Diana logo are trademarks of
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain 2021

Copyright © Bettina Reitz-Joosse, Marian W. Makins, C. J. Mackie & Contributors 2021

Bettina Reitz-Joosse, Marian W. Makins and C. J. Mackie have asserted their right under the Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Editors of this work.

For legal purposes the Acknowledgements on p. x constitute an extension of this copyright page.

Cover design: Terry Woodley
Cover image © *Battle of Lake Trasimene*, Léonard Thiry (*c*. 1500–1550). Universal Images Group / Getty

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc does not have any control over, or responsibility for, any third-party websites
referred to or in this book. All internet addresses given in this book were correct at the time of going
to press. The author and publisher regret any inconvenience caused if addresses have changed
or sites have ceased to exist, but can accept no responsibility for any such changes.

This work is published open access subject to a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial NoDerivatives
4.0 International licence (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0, https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/). You may
re-use, distribute, and reproduce this work in any medium for non-commercial purposes, provided you give
attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Reitz-Joosse, Bettina, editor. | Makins, Marian W., editor. |Mackie, C. J. (Christopher J.), 1954– editor.
Title: Landscapes of war in Greek and Roman literature / edited by BettinaReitz-Joosse,
Marian W. Makins, and C. J. Mackie.
Description: London ; New York : Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. | Includes bibliographical references and index. |
Identifiers: LCCN 2020034851 (print) | LCCN 2020034852 (ebook) | ISBN9781350157903 (hardcover) |
ISBN 9781350157910 (ebook) | ISBN9781350157927 (epub)
Subjects: LCSH: Classical literature–History and criticism. | War inliterature. | Landscapes in literature.
Classification: LCC PA3015.W46 L36 2021 (print) | LCC PA3015.W46 (ebook)| DDC 880.09/3581—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020034851
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020034852

ISBN: HB: 978-1-3501-5790-3
ePDF: 978-1-3501-5791-0
eBook: 978-1-3501-5792-7

Typeset by RefineCatch Limited, Bungay, Suffolk

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com
and sign up for our newsletters.

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations vii
Notes on Contributors viii
Acknowledgements x

Introduction *Marian W. Makins and Bettina Reitz-Joosse* 1

Part I Perception and Experience of War Landscapes

1 **Homer's Landscape of War: Spatial Mental Model and Cognitive Collage** *Elizabeth Minchin* 25

2 **War, Weather and Landscape in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*** *Virginia Fabrizi* 38

3 **The Challenge of Historiographic *Enargeia* and the Battle of Lake Trasimene** *Andrew Feldherr* 62

Part II Landscapes of Ruin and Recovery

4 **The Problems with Agricultural Recovery in Lucan's Civil War Narrative** *Laura Zientek* 91

5 **Landscapes in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* and the Poetry of the First World War** *William Brockliss* 111

6 **Dissenting Voices in Propertius's Post-War Landscapes** *Marian W. Makins* 131

Part III Controlling Landscapes and the Symbolism of Power

7 **Justifying Civil War: Interactions between Caesar and the Italian Landscape in Lucan's Rubicon Passage (*BC* 1.183–235)** *Esther Meijer* 157

8 **Writing a Landscape of Defeat: The Romans in Parthia** *Bettina Reitz-Joosse* 177

9 **Landscape and Character in Herodian's *History of the Roman Empire*: The War between Niger and Severus** *Karine Laporte* 193

Part IV Memory in War Landscapes

10 **Seascapes of War: Herodotus's Littoral Gaze on the Battle of Salamis** *J. Z. van Rookhuijzen* 213

11 War in a Landscape: The Dardanelles from Homer to Gallipoli
C. J. Mackie 229

12 Mutable Monuments and Mutable Memories in Lucan's *Bellum Civile* and the Former Yugoslavia *Jesse Weiner* 241

Index Locorum 262
Index 273

CONTRIBUTORS

William Brockliss is Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. He studies interactions between Greek and Roman texts and the natural environment, as reflected in his monograph, *Homeric Imagery and the Natural Environment* (Center for Hellenic Studies, 2019). He has also published on topics such as the nightmare (*Illinois Classical Studies* 2017), monstrosity (*Classical Journal* 2018) and the abject (D. Felton, ed., *Landscapes of Dread*, 2018), in preparation for a second book, *Horror in Ancient Epic*.

Virginia Fabrizi obtained her PhD at the University of Udine and held postdoctoral positions at the Freie Universität Berlin and the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität of Munich. She is currently working as an Italian teacher in Munich and is affiliated with the University of Pavia as a 'Cultore della materia' in Classical Philology. She published a book on the representation of Roman history in Ennius's *Annales* entitled *Mores veteresque novosque: rappresentazioni del passato e del presente di Roma negli Annales di Ennio* (2012) as well as several articles on Livy, in particular on the narrative construction of space in the *Ab Urbe Condita*.

Andrew Feldherr (PhD Berkeley 1991) is Professor of Classics at Princeton University. He works on Latin Literature, with a particular interest in historiography and the poetry of the Augustan period. A main focus of his scholarship has been on how political and social forces transform conceptions of the function of literature during the Roman Republic and Empire.

Karine Laporte is a PhD candidate at Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society. Her dissertation is on narrative patterns in ancient historiography and, in particular, how Herodian engages with this practice in the *History of the Roman Empire*. She has forthcoming articles further exploring Herodian's method of composition, specifically his use of imperial death notices (with O. J. Hekster) and of stock character types.

C. J. Mackie (PhD Glasgow) is Professor of Classics and Ancient History at La Trobe University. He has written widely on Greek and Roman topics, especially Vergil, Homer and Greek mythology. Much of his research focuses on the Trojan War, as told by the Greek and Roman sources, and the impact of these accounts on the later European tradition of war narratives. More recently he has developed interests in the Gallipoli region of western Turkey, and was on a three-nation team (Australia, New Zealand and Turkey) carrying out a historical and archaeological survey of the Anzac battlefield. He is a regular contributor to *The Conversation*.

Marian W. Makins (PhD University of Pennsylvania) is Assistant Professor of Instruction in Greek and Roman Classics at Temple University in Philadelphia. Her current research

focuses on intersections between war, death and landscape in Roman culture and its reception. She has also published articles on classical receptions in the nonsense of Edward Lear, J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* and the Hunger Games trilogy.

Esther Meijer is a PhD candidate in Classics at Durham University (UK). She works on landscape and identity in Neronian and Flavian literature, with particular attention to intertextuality and rhetoric of empire. Further research interests include metapoetics, (poetic) geographies and Flavian panegyric, especially Statius's *Silvae*. She is currently co-editing a volume with Mark Heerink on Flavian responses to Nero's Rome.

Elizabeth Minchin is Emeritus Professor in the Centre for Classical Studies at the Australian National University, Canberra. Her research publications cover memory in its various aspects, whether personal, social or cultural, particularly as we observe its operations in the Homeric epics; landscape too is an interest, especially as it interlocks with memory. Her publications include *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey* (2001) and *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender* (2007) and numerous articles and book chapters.

Bettina Reitz-Joosse is Associate Professor of Latin Language and Literature at the University of Groningen (Netherlands). Her work focuses on the relationship between literary texts and material culture in the ancient Roman world and on the reception of Roman antiquity under Italian Fascism.

J. Z. van Rookhuijzen is a researcher and lecturer at the universities of Utrecht and Leiden (Netherlands) and member of the National Research School of Classical Studies (OIKOS). His doctoral work examined the role of memory in Herodotus's account of the Persian Wars, resulting in the monograph *Herodotus and the Topography of Xerxes' Invasion* (2018). He currently investigates the archaeology and reception history of the Acropolis of Athens. This project, funded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO), traces the role of narratives in current ideas of the Acropolis temples and has been featured in National Geographic.

Jesse Weiner is Assistant Professor of Classics at Hamilton College (USA). He publishes broadly on Greek and Latin literature and its reception, with special interests in monumentality and memory, sexuality and gender, and aesthetics. In public humanities, his work has appeared in *History Today* and *The Atlantic*. He is co-editor of *Frankenstein and Its Classics: The Modern Prometheus from Antiquity to Science Fiction* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2018).

Laura Zientek is Visiting Assistant Professor of Classics and Humanities at Reed College. Her research focuses on the intersection of landscape representation and natural philosophy in Roman literature, with special interests in ecocriticism, biocosmology and horror. Her publications include analyses of the sublime, landscape aesthetics and depictions of mining. She is co-editor of *Lucan's Imperial World: The Bellum Civile in Its Contemporary Contexts* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2020).

CHAPTER 7
JUSTIFYING CIVIL WAR: INTERACTIONS BETWEEN CAESAR AND THE ITALIAN LANDSCAPE IN LUCAN'S RUBICON PASSAGE (*BC* 1.183–235)

Esther Meijer

1 Introduction

Many of Lucan's landscapes show the effects of civil war, from the bloody red Massilian sea to Pharsalus, marked by Roman bloodshed in the decisive battle between Caesar and Pompey.[1] In this chapter, I consider the event that turns Italy itself into a landscape of war: Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon in Book 1. In this scene, the apparition of *Patria* begs Caesar not to proceed, and the Rubicon swells up in an attempt to hinder the general's passage.[2] I discuss how, in response to the protesting Italian landscape, Caesar attempts to justify his actions, and I suggest that he does so by evoking Roman rituals of war, including the fetial ritual of lawfully declaring war against a foreign enemy and fetial treaty solemnization.

We might wonder to what extent Caesar's engagement with these rituals justifies the civil war he is about to undertake, and how Caesar's actions compare to those of Pompey. By comparing the presentation of Roman rituals of war here with parallels in Pompey's proposed collaboration with the Parthians in Book 8 and the failed treaty between Aeneas and Latinus in *Aeneid* 12, I show how Caesar's interactions with the Italian landscape highlight the impossibility of constructing the civil war between Caesar and Pompey as a just war. Through this discussion, I explore what this impossibility might contribute to our understanding of Lucan's perception of the civil war that instigated the transition from Republic to Principate.

[1] For war and its transformative effects on landscapes, see e.g. Masters (1992), O'Gorman (1995), Leigh (2010), Hughes (2013), Zientek (2014), Ambühl (2016), Reitz-Joosse (2016), and many chapters in this volume.

[2] Swelling rivers are found in ancient literature from Homer onwards. See e.g. the introduction to this volume (3–14) on the Scamander in the *Iliad*. This is one of the few moments in Lucan's *Civil War* that forces the characteristically speedy general to slow down: after crossing the Rubicon, hardly anything forms an obstacle to Caesar's movement. Masters (1992: 1–10) has famously argued that the passage, as the work's proper opening, is programmatic for the entire *Civil War*, in the sense that it sets up contradictions between Caesar's urgency in crossing boundaries and Lucan's narrative obstructions to or compliances with Caesar's progress. Lucan's Caesar is generally characterized by great haste – perhaps a continuation of the general's rapid advance through Italy as it was represented in Caesar's *Civil War* and Cicero's letters. Cf. Roche (2009: 192–4, 204), Peer (2015: 59–61), Adema (2017: 237–9). Cf. also Caes. *BCiv*. 1.8; Cic. *Att*. 7.22.1, 8.13.1, 7.20.1.

2 Decentralizing Rome: landscape and identity

Lucan's landscapes often function as a medium through which civil conflict is articulated and political, civic and socio-cultural issues are explored.[3] Rivers and oceans in particular play an important role in this.[4] When the epic arrives at the Rubicon, we have already encountered such exploratory landscapes: the deserted and half-destroyed fields of Italy contrast with their fertile and cultivated counterparts in Virgil's *Georgics*, and, as Laura Zientek discusses in her chapter in this volume, hint at the impossibility of agricultural recovery and the sometimes permanent effects of this civil war. This uncultivated landscape contrasts poignantly with Rome's (self-)image as a community of farmer-citizens whose identity was rooted in working the land,[5] which can be seen in the context of Roman ethnocentrism, a model of Roman space that contrasts its centre, Rome, to its periphery in various expanding concentric circles: Italy, territory under Roman control, and the borders of the known world.[6] This Romanocentric approach, closely tied to Roman identity, generates a paradoxical dialectic between expansion and enclosure. How does one keep expanding the *imperium sine fine*, while maintaining supposedly impermeable boundaries and a fixed and solid Roman centre?[7] This anxiety underlies the decentralization of Rome and the Roman world that is recurrent throughout Lucan's *Civil War*.[8]

Crucially, this decentralization is prompted by Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon, which effectively collapses the legal boundary between two of these concentric circles, namely outside space (territory under Roman control) and inside space (Italy).[9] Accordingly, the Rubicon, a topographical referent that used to provide meaning within this spatial model of identity, loses its legal meaning. Caesar's crossing then does not only introduce us to some of the main themes of Lucan's epic and instigate the beginning of the civil war, but it also signals a conceptual shift in – or even an uprooting of – Roman identity.[10]

---

[3] My chapter complements groundwork laid especially by Gowing (2005), Spencer (2005, 2010), Thorne (2011), Dinter (2012), Zientek (2014 and her chapter in this volume).

[4] Bexley (2014: 374). Cf. e.g. the Tiber filled with blood and corpses of previous civil war victims (2.209–20); the sea battle at Massilia with water making corpses' features unrecognizable (3.509–672); the Araxes where Crassus died (8.431–9); Pompey's corpse buried at the edge of the land bordering on the sea (8.712–822); and, in contrast, Caesar claiming that he would not even mind being buried under the waves – as long as he is feared forever and by everyone (5.654–71).

[5] Cf. Leach (1974), Hardie (2006), Skoie (2006), Spencer (2010). See e.g. Cato *Agr. praef.*; Varro *Rust*. 2, *praef.* 1–2; Sall. *Cat*. 2, 10–13; Verg. *Ecl*. passim.

[6] Nicolet (1991: 29–33), Romm (1992: 46–8), Jaeger (1997: 9–10).

[7] Jaeger (1997), Rimell (2015).

[8] On decentralization in Lucan, see e.g. Ahl (1976: 170–3), Masters (1992: 93–9), Rossi (2000), Bexley (2014).

[9] Myers (2011) discusses how Lucan dismantles these traditional Roman notions of centre and periphery and creates a new concept of Roman space defined by the transgressions and violence of Caesar. I discuss the legal ramifications of the Rubicon crossing below (pp. 160–1).

[10] The Rubicon had probably not even been the legal boundary for that long: either for thirty years, if we believe that Sulla changed the boundary from the Aesis to the Rubicon around 80 BCE (see Mommsen (1863: 367–8), Hardy (1916: 66–8), Sumi (2002: 425–6)), or for eighty years, if we believe that Tiberius Gracchus moved the boundary to the Rubicon (for which, see Cuntz (1902: 28–34), Walbank (1957: 396–7) and (1972:

In what follows, I discuss how the Italian landscape protests its loss of meaning prompted by Caesar's advance on Rome visually, verbally and physically, and how Caesar then attempts to justify himself. He does so by evoking Roman rituals of war, including the fetial ritual of lawfully declaring war against a foreign enemy and fetial treaty solemnization. Soon, however, Caesar ends his diplomatic efforts and violates the landscape – and thereby Italy itself – by crossing the physically protesting river and deliberately seeking war. This illustrates the poem's conflation of *ius* and *scelus* (*ius datumque sceleri*, 1.2) and supports the general sense of disapproval, outrage and despair at civil war that permeates the epic.

3 Arriving at the riverbanks: *Patria* voices her concerns

After Caesar has crossed the Alps, he reaches the Rubicon (1.182–5). At the banks of the river, the *imago* of a visibly distressed *Patria* appears to him (1.186–9):

> ingens visa duci patriae trepidantis imago
> clara per obscuram vultu maestissima noctem
> turrigero canos effundens vertice crines
> caesarie lacera nudisque adstare lacertis, . . .[11]
>
> Clearly to the leader through the murky night appeared
> a mighty image of his country in distress, grief in her face,
> her white hair streaming from her tower-crowned head;
> with tresses torn and shoulders bare she stood before him, . . .

Several details of *Patria*'s portrayal correspond to common expressions of grief. Her loose hair, torn tresses and naked arms contribute to the image of a sorrowful, mourning *Patria*. She is also wearing a tower-crown (*turrigero*, 1.188). This image, I suggest, evokes the personifications of cities, peoples, and their lands as familiar from Roman iconography and triumphal processions.[12] Some of these representations feature conquered peoples wearing Greek dress, hairstyle and a mural crown, and adopting a friendly stance, indicating Roman construction of these peoples as adopted members of

24)). As such, the Rubicon losing its meaning represents only one step of a longer process in which Romans kept adapting their spatial identity. In fact, one could argue that continuous adaptation is inherent to Roman identity, as, from the early Kingdom onwards, Rome kept expanding its 'elastic' walls, and the integration of new citizens into an existing *patria* was an ever-existing issue (see Konstan (1986), Rimell (2015: 30–2)). Yet this particular instance of a topographic referent losing its meaning is especially relevant, as Rome's 'elastic' walls now move *inwards* rather than outwards, and as, from Lucan onwards, this moment was interpreted as related to a change of political institution.

[11] Citations of the Latin are from Shackleton Bailey (2009); translations are from Braund (2008).

[12] Gardner (1988), Ostrowski (1996), Östenberg (2009: 204–8). Roche (2009: 208) notes that, from the early second century CE, *Italia* is represented with a tower-crown on coins and (probably) on the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum.

the Roman community. But Lucan's *Patria* is more reminiscent of conquered peoples depicted as grieving and wearing unbridled hair, illustrating Rome's representation of them as conquered enemies and emphasizing Rome's (military) supremacy.[13] *Patria*'s mural crown underlines not only the fact that she represents the city of Rome, but – as mural crowns often emphasize the military siege of the places represented in Roman triumphs and reliefs[14] – it also anticipates Caesar's imminent conquest of the *urbs aeterna*. Perhaps, then, her image shows the transition and decentralization that Italy will go through as Caesar crosses the Rubicon: from the heart of the Roman community to one of Caesar's conquered enemies.[15] *Patria*'s evocation of triumphal iconography is particularly salient considering that Caesar's return to Italy from Gaul should have been accompanied by triumphs.[16] Instead, he is presented with a perverse and unjustified type of triumph: one acquired by the undertaking of civil war.[17] Next, *Patria*'s speech underlines the issues of justice and legality evoked by Caesar's actions (1.190–2):

> 'quo tenditis ultra?
> quo fertis mea signa, viri? si iure venitis,
> si cives, huc usque licet.'

> 'Where further do you march?
> Where do you take my standards, warriors? If lawfully you come,
> if as citizens, this far only is allowed.'

Patria's question about and appropriation of the Roman military standards (*mea signa*, 1.191) immediately calls attention to Caesar's belligerent and unlawful intentions.[18] She points out that the general and his army must stop here at the border of Italy if they have come as law-abiding citizens. After all, it was prohibited for generals or governors to guide their legions out of their assigned provinces since Sulla's establishment of the *lex Cornelia de maiestate*.[19] The anaphora *si iure venitis, si cives* (1.190–1) reminds us hereof and emphasizes the legal ramifications of *Patria*'s request. As such, *Patria*'s speech revisits

---

[13] Ostrowski (1996), Östenberg (2009: 205–8). The distinction was first made by Bienkowski (1900).

[14] Östenberg (2009: 204–5).

[15] *Patria*'s appearance has also been recognized to evoke Hector's apparition to Aeneas on the night of Troy's destruction at Verg. *Aen*. 2.268–97. Zientek (2014: 45–6) suggests that Lucan's *Patria* is a re-imagination of Roma's triumphant appearance in Anchises' speech about Rome's glorious future in *Aen.* 6.781–7. Mulhern (2017) points out *Patria*'s similarities to Roman *matronae* and widows, and interprets Caesar's rejection of her as indifference to Rome, as he 'embarks on his road away from his wife, Rome and Romanness to tyranny, luxury and a mistress'. Clearly, *Patria*'s appearance here is poignant and related to Rome's future.

[16] Cf. e.g. 1.286–9, 7.254–60.

[17] Cf. 1.12: *bella geri placuit nullos habitura triumphos*?: 'did you choose to wage wars which would bring no triumphs?'

[18] Throughout the epic, Pompey (2.592), Caesar (5.349) and Cato (9.281) all claim the *signa* for themselves. Cf. Roche (2009: 209).

[19] Cf. Cic. *Pis*. 50. Lintott (1981: 54–8) and Braga (2014: 89–91) discuss a potential precedent of this law, namely the *lex Porcia*. The precise date of this law is debated (possibly dating back to the second century BCE but definitely no later than 100 BCE), and it seems to have included prescriptions for governors, including a restriction of movement for governors with their armies.

the themes of transgression and *ius* as set out in the poem's introduction and marks their importance for the crossing.[20]

What is more, *Patria*'s speech sets up a negotiation between herself and Caesar. This negotiation is both spatial and legal: the river Rubicon is a physical element fixed onto terrestrial space, but it also has legal properties and differentiates Roman citizens on the inside from others, including potential enemies, on the outside. Therefore, Caesar's relation to *Patria* is currently defined by his position in space: if he decides to cross the boundary as a soldier, he becomes an enemy to the state, and Rome in turn becomes Caesar's enemy.[21] *Patria*'s appearance already shows the potential consequences of this action. It is now up to Caesar to respond to *Patria*'s concerns.

4 Caesar's response: rituals of war

Caesar's first reaction to *Patria*'s supernatural appearance is to tremble: perplexed, he halts on the edge of the riverbank (1.192–4). Soon, however, he picks himself up and responds with a speech that includes an invocation of several gods. These deities, characteristic of the Julio-Claudian emperors, are generally interpreted as a prefiguration of the Principate that Caesar's victory in this civil war helped to bring about.[22] Additionally, I suggest, they recall deities that are associated with Roman war rituals, especially fetial procedures of war declaration and treaty solemnization. Before discussing how Caesar's words and actions evoke these rituals, I will briefly contextualize the *fetiales* and their relevance to Caesar.

The *fetiales* are considered to be an old priesthood, dating back to the early Roman Kingdom.[23] The priests, the fetials, were traditionally involved with the Romans' relations with other peoples. They were responsible among other things for formal diplomatic action, including the performance of rituals by which a *bellum iustum*, a just war,[24] could be started, the solemnization of treaties, and the surrender of Romans who did not adhere to these procedures. As such, the fetials played an important role in Roman relations with other peoples, especially their enemies.

[20] Cf. 1.1: *bella . . . plus quam civilia*, introducing the theme of transgression, and 1.2: *ius . . . datum sceleri*, underlining the importance of *ius*.

[21] I owe my understanding of legal space in this passage to Willis (2011: 59–60).

[22] Grimal (1970: 56–9), Roche (2009: 210–2).

[23] A vast range of research on the fetials and related topics has been published. A selection includes Samter (1909), Wissowa (1912: 550–4), Ogilvie (1965), Ziegler (1972), Rich (1976), Saulnier (1980), Wiedemann (1986), Rüpke (1990: 97–124), Beard, North and Price (1998: 26–7), Santangelo (2008), Ager (2009: 17–25), Rich (2011: 187–90, 2013: 559–64). For a comprehensive overview of relevant scholarship, cf. Santangelo (2008: 63–4, nn. 1–2).

[24] The concept of 'just war' was likely well embedded in earlier Roman culture, but we only find developed views on it in the first century BCE. Cicero (*Off.* 1.11) discusses when it is just to commence a war, namely when others have harmed or threaten to harm the Romans, and emphasizes that no war is just or pious, unless a formal declaration of war has been made by the *fetiales* (see Ager (2009: 21–2), Cornwell (2015: 335–7)). For *bellum iustum* in association with the *fetiales*, see Cic. *Off.* 3.30.107–8, *Rep.* 2.17, 2.31; Livy 1.32.12, 42.47.8; Dion. Hal. 2.72.4.

While outlining the history of the fetial priesthood is quite complicated, as much of our evidence dates to the imperial period, the *fetiales* appear to have been active throughout the Republic.[25] Fetial ritual was certainly in the public eye during the imperial period,[26] when Augustus revived certain fetial rituals that were probably little known by then, although there must have been an established tradition for them, and incorporated them in the construction and justification of his autocratic regime. This includes Augustus's version of the fetial declaration of a just war by means of throwing a spear into the *ager quasi hostilis* near the Columna Bellica in an effort to officially declare war against Mark Antony and Cleopatra, as well as his closure of the so-called Gates of War.[27] Now most of our evidence regarding fetial rituals of war derives from antiquarian constructions of around this time.[28] In fact, sources on the fetial priesthood – mainly Livy (1.24.4–9, 32.6–10) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.72.6–8) – mostly date from the early Principate onwards.[29] But fetial ritual procedures will probably not have been as clearly defined as these constructions may make us think. In fact, Livy's accounts appear to conflate fetial rituals,[30] and Virgil's rituals of war in the *Aeneid* evoke different aspects of fetial rituals too.[31] It is these recent and conflated fetial rituals of war that Lucan engages with in this passage.

Moreover, Caesar himself had a background in priesthood: as a young man he was nominated for the office of *flamen Dialis*. Later, he was elected to the pontificate and eventually he became *pontifex maximus*.[32] He also had personal experience with one of the fetials' practices: *deditio*, the surrender of Romans who had not adhered to fetial procedures or treaties, in order to deflect divine punishment from Rome.[33] In 55 BCE, Cato argued that Caesar should be surrendered to two German tribes, the Tencteri and Usipetes, since he had attacked them during a truce and massacred their diplomats.[34] Although Cato's motion was met with contempt and the *deditio* did not take place, Caesar can be seen to justify his actions in his *Gallic Wars*: he explains that he had to act swiftly to avoid a more serious war, as the Germans' supposedly violent behaviour constituted an increasing danger.[35] This is only one instance of diplomacy and rituals of

[25] See recently Santangelo (2008), Rich (2011: 190), Zollschan (2012: 119–44).

[26] Beard *et al.* (1998: 186), Rich (2011: 189): although it was probably one of the lesser priesthoods, the fetial college in the imperial period included members of the imperial family and some distinguished senators. See Rüpke (2008: 973–4) for a list of thirty-five *fetiales* in the imperial period, subsequently supplemented by Zollschan (2009).

[27] Rich (2013: 544, 561). As he explicitly mentions in his *Res Gestae* (*RG* 7), Augustus was a *fetialis* himself. On the closure of the Gates of War, cf. *RG* 13 and DeBrohun (2007: 258–60).

[28] Rich (2013: 595–64).

[29] See also e.g. Var. *Ling*. 5.86; Cic. *Leg.* 2.9, *Off.* 1.11; Livy 9.5, 10.45, 30.43; Plin. *HN* 22.2–3; Plut. *Num*. 12.3–5; Suet. *Claud.* 22, 25.5; Serv. 1.62, 9.52–3, 10.14.

[30] Rich (2013: 561–2).

[31] Cf. the opening of the Gates of War in Verg. *Aen*. 7.601–17 with Horsfall (2000: 391–2) and DeBrohun (2007: 263–9). I briefly discuss fetial treaty solemnization in the *Aeneid* below (pp. 169–70).

[32] It is generally agreed upon that Caesar was never inaugurated as *flamen Dialis*. Cf. Taylor (1941: 113–16) and Ridley (2000: 214–15).

[33] For *deditio*, see Rüpke (1990: 110–11), Ager (2009: 22), Rich (2011: 195–9).

[34] Cf. Plut. *Cat. Min*. 51.1-2, *Caes*. 22.4, *Comp. Nic. et Crass*. 4.3; Suet. *Iul*. 24.3.

[35] Caes. *BGal.* 4. Cf. Powell (2009), Morrell (2015).

war in Caesar's works. Notably, such diplomatic moments typically affect the pace of the narrative in strategic ways: Suzanne Adema discusses how, in Caesar's *Civil War*, long speeches that slow down the narrative tempo frequently occur in episodes in which diplomatic efforts are emphasized, but notes that the narrator focuses more on physical actions when negotiations are finished – or when they seem pointless from the start.[36] We will see that Caesar's strategic diplomacy contributes to the pace of Lucan's narrative too. Thus, Caesar's priesthood as *pontifex maximus* – undoubtedly still known to many people in Lucan's time due to his introduction of the Julian calendar – as well as his personal experience with diplomatic practices and rituals of war serve as a fertile background for Lucan's Rubicon passage.

5 Caesar's response: an invocation of ancient Roman gods

By travelling to the enemy's frontier and standing just outside it, Caesar has already fulfilled the first step of the fetial procedure of declaring war.[37] He then invokes a selection of gods to testify that his demands and actions are just, makes an implied demand – namely that he can cross the boundary as *Patria*'s *miles* rather than as citizen – and assigns blame to Pompey, his enemy. These actions are reminiscent of the three phases of fetial war declaration, namely *rerum repetitio* (stating one's complaints and demands at the enemy's frontier and swearing by a selection of gods that they are just), *testatio* (returning to the enemy's boundary and calling upon the gods to witness that people's injustice and the Romans' legitimate cause), and *indictio belli* (the official war declaration, a speech indicting the guilty party possibly accompanied by the throwing of a spear into the hostile territory).[38] Just as in Livy, these phases are conflated both with each other and with additional fetial rituals, including the solemnization of treaties. To start with, Caesar begins his speech with an invocation of several gods (1.195–200):

> mox ait 'o magnae qui moenia prospicis urbis
> Tarpeia de rupe Tonans Phrygiique penates
> gentis Iuleae et rapti secreta Quirini
> et residens celsa Latiaris Iuppiter Alba
> Vestalesque foci summique o numinis instar
> Roma, fave coeptis . . .'

> At last he speaks: 'O Thunderer, surveying great Rome's
> walls from the Tarpeian Rock; O Phrygian house-gods of Iulus's clan

[36] Adema (2016: 225 and 2017: 237–9).
[37] Ogilvie (1965: 111), Rüpke (1990: 101–3). Cf. e.g. Livy 1.24.6, 8.14.5; Plin. *HN* 1.1.70; Serv. 9.52, 12.120.
[38] For a more elaborate discussion of the phases of fetial war declaration, see Holland (1961: 61–2), Ogilvie (1965: 127–8), Rüpke (1990: 99–109), Rich (2011). As discussed earlier, this is unlikely to be an accurate representation of the ritual as it was historically performed (Rich 2011 and 2013).

and mysteries of Quirinus, who was carried off to heaven;
O Jupiter of Latium, seated in lofty Alba,
and hearths of Vesta; O Rome, the equal of the highest
deity, favour my plans . . .'

Firstly, in an act reminiscent of the oaths by Jupiter sworn in fetial ritual,[39] Caesar addresses Jupiter. The reference to the Tarpeian Rock recalls a historical paradigm of treachery,[40] since notorious criminals were hurled off the Rock to their deaths. Clearly, Caesar has understood *Patria*'s warning and is aware of what awaits him, should he transgress the law. Moreover, the temple of Jupiter Tonans was close to the Tarpeian Rock. This temple played an important role in the fetial ritual of solemnizing a *foedus*, a treaty.[41] The invocation of Jupiter Tonans, combined with the reference to the Tarpeian Rock and its associations of solemnizing and entering into treaties, makes it likely that Jupiter is called upon here as a witness to Caesar's speech in his capacity as the divine law-maker.[42] Caesar is here as Rome's *miles* (1.202), for the benefit of the state: may Jupiter strike him down with his thunderbolt, a common punishment for breaking a fetial treaty, if he is not.[43]

Caesar also calls upon Quirinus (1.197), which is usually interpreted as Caesar emphasizing his claim to Aeneas's heritage.[44] Quirinus was also called upon in the fetial *testatio* as an epithet of Janus,[45] and features in Polybius's account as one of the gods by whom the treaty between the Romans and Carthaginians was sworn in 279 BCE (Polyb. 3.25). The invocation might also have evoked memories of Janus Quirinus, whose temple doors – the so-called Gates of War presumably dating back to early Rome – were closed by Augustus to signal the pacification of the Empire through his victory in the civil war with Mark Antony and Cleopatra.[46] This aspect of Janus Quirinus, peace through victory, would have been particularly welcome to Augustan Rome after generations of (civil) wars. Lucan's Caesar here anticipates an idea that is specified later in his speech: the Republic needs to be pacified through Caesar's victory in this civil war, just as Augustus's victory paved the way for a pacified Principate. Thus, Quirinus's name with its connotations evokes a concern with the proper (ritual) beginnings and endings of wars that date back to early Roman times and that were particularly present in Roman society

---

[39] Livy 1.32.6–7, 1.32.10; Dion. Hal. 2.72.6, 2.72.8.
[40] Roche (2009: 212).
[41] Var. *Ling*. 5.41. See Springer (1954: 28).
[42] A similar invocation of Jupiter Tonans is found in Book 8, where Pompey refers to his seemingly fetial treaty with the Parthians (8.218–20). See below, pp. 165–6.
[43] The priest would swear that the Romans would not break the treaty, and if they would, Jupiter should smite them – much as the priest then struck a pig with a flint. Cf. Livy 1.24.7–9.
[44] Roche (2009: 212).
[45] Cf. Livy 1.32.10. Livy's manuscripts read *Iuno Quirine*, which has been emendated to *Iane Quirine*, as *et tu* indicates only one other god rather than two, and as the god Janus Quirinus is attested in several sources (cf. Aug. *RG*. 13; Hor. *Carm*. 4.15.9; Suet. *Aug*. 22; Macr. *Sat.* 1.9.16). For discussion, cf. e.g. Schilling (1960), Holland (1961: 60), Ogilvie (1965: 131–2).
[46] Quirinus as epithet for Janus was particularly favoured by Augustus (*RG* 13) and appears in Augustan literature onwards.

since Augustus's embracement and revival of them. As such, Lucan's Caesar anticipates and recalls Augustus's strategic employment of war rituals.

Next, Caesar invokes Jupiter *Latiaris*. This cult title belonged to Jupiter as he was worshipped on Mons Albanus, as the god of the Latin League. The League annually celebrated the *feriae Latinae* in his honour, when its members reinforced and honoured their ancient treaty through ritual sacrifice and a common meal.[47] In Republican times, the consuls were in charge of the festival: enacting the rituals properly bestowed them with authority and divine sanction and allowed them to leave Rome for provinces or military campaigns.[48] Caesar himself had a special relationship with the *feriae Latinae*, not in the least because the festival took place on Mons Albanus of which the *gens Iulia* was the custodian. Despite being in a hurry to chase Pompey to Greece in 49 BCE, Caesar took the time to celebrate the festival.[49] Following a passage about Caesar's acquisition and abuse of a range of powers and offices, Lucan describes Caesar's celebration of the *feriae Latinae*, that, the poet says, Jupiter Latiaris did not even deserve after Latium was conquered by the general (5.400–2). Caesar's invocation of Jupiter *Latiaris* therefore anticipates and evokes memories of his conquest of Italy and rise to power through civil war, which stands in stark contrast to the god's original association with the ancient treaty between the members of the Latin League.

Finally, Caesar calls upon Roma in what can be seen as the second important invocation of the fetials' *rerum repetitio* – in addition to Jupiter's invocation – namely that of the boundaries of the respective people.[50] Caesar emphasizes that Roma is equal to the other deities invoked (1.199: *summique o numinis instar*), one of several allusions to an episode in Book 8 that is connected to Caesar's Rubicon passage both intertextually and thematically.

Following Pompey's request to Deiotarus, king of Galatia, to deliver a request for assistance to the Parthian king (8.202–40), Pompey addresses an assembly of senators in an effort to legitimize his plan to enlist the Parthians' help against Caesar. In his speech, Pompey adapts the formula ***numinis instar*** and replaces *numinis* with *patriae* (8.262–3: *comites bellique fugaeque* | *atque* ***instar patriae***). He emphasizes that they still represent Italy despite having fled: essentially, the senate is having a meeting in exile.[51] Thus, Pompey's *instar patriae* calls attention to the decentralization of Rome and the Roman world prompted by Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon and his advance on Rome.[52]

Pompey's proposition to the Parthians also includes a reminder of the ancient treaties sworn between him and the Parthians (8.218–20):

---

[47] Cf. Fowler (1899: 95–7), Pasqualini (1996), Grandazzi (2008: 517–729), Simón (2011: 95–7). Cf. Var. *Ling.* 6.25; Livy 32.1; Dion. Hal. 4.49; Plin. *HN* 3.68; Macrob. *Sat.* 1.16.16.

[48] Simón (2011: 116–8, 124–6). If the consuls would not do so, they would be subject to failure, as befell C. Flaminius in 218 BCE and the consuls Aulus Hirtius and Vibius Pansa in 43 BCE (cf. respectively Livy 21.63.5–9, 22.1.4–7 and Cass. Dio 46.33–4).

[49] Caes. *BCiv*. 3.2. On Caesar and the *feriae Latinae*, see Pasqualini (1996: 251), Smith (2012: 275ff.), Luke (2014: 125ff.).

[50] Feeney (1991: 294) notes that the Republic's *Patria* speaks to Caesar, who invokes imperial Roma instead.

[51] Cf. 8.260–327. Cf. Roche (2009: 212–3).

[52] On this passage, and on geographic disorder in the *Civil War* more generally, see Ahl (1976: 170–3), Masters (1992: 93–9), Rossi (2000), Bexley (2014), as well as Reitz-Joosse (in this volume).

si **foedera** nobis
prisca manent mihi **per Latium** iurata **Tonantem**,
per vestros astricta magos, . . .

If your former pact
with me remains in force – the pact I swore by the Thunderer of Latium,
the pact your holy men ratified – . . .

Whether this treaty was historically sworn or not,[53] the reference to Jupiter *Tonans* suggests a fetial *foedus* and the additional reference to Latium evokes Caesar's invocation of both Jupiter *Tonans* and Jupiter *Latiaris*. Pompey's request also includes an appeal to Parthia to burst from her bounds and cross the Euphrates (9.235–6):

tot meritis obstricta meis nunc Parthia ruptis
excedat claustris **vetitam** per saecula **ripam** . . .

Now let Parthia, bound by all my services, break through
her boundaries and cross the bank forbidden through the centuries . . .

Pompey's words evoke Caesar's Rubicon crossing (1.223–5):

Caesar, ut adversam superato gurgite **ripam**
attigit, Hesperiae **vetitis** et constitit **arvis** . . .

When Caesar had crossed the flood and reached the opposite
bank, on Hesperia's forbidden fields he took his stand . . .

The intertext suggests a parallel between the Rubicon and the Euphrates, with both rivers representing the boundaries of the Roman Empire with respectively Gaul and Parthia.[54] The connection between the passages is established further by the words with which Pompey ends the speech to his troops, identical both in wording and position to Caesar's final invocation: *Roma, fave coeptis*; 'Rome, smile on my enterprise' (1.200 and 8.322).

Both rivals' enterprises cross multiple boundaries. Caesar's quest crosses moral, political and legal boundaries and allows civil war to enter the Roman Empire. Pompey, on the other hand, suggests resorting to barbarian troops to fight his war for him, thereby potentially enabling them to defeat the Romans. This is emphasized by Lentulus, who perceives Pompey's request to enlist the stereotypically barbarian Parthians as a danger

[53] Mayer (1981: 115) follows Lintott (1971: 501, n. 14) in concluding that there is no good evidence for an actual treaty and suggests that Lucan might have been thinking of the Parthian embassy to Pompey in 63 BCE in Syria (cf. App. *Mith*. 106; Plut. *Pomp*. 39.3).

[54] These words are only in such close vicinity to each other here and in 10.330: *modumque* ***vetat*** *crescendi ponere* ***ripas***, 'and [Memphis] forbids your banks to set a limit to your growth'; the final words of priest Acoreus's lengthy Nile-description. This intertext is less relevant to my discussion because grammar and context are different, but it is interesting that these similar words occur in a description of another river that fascinated the Romans.

not only to the Roman Empire itself, but also to what makes the Romans Roman.[55] Pompey's proposal is as dangerous for the Roman Empire and its values – if not more so – as Caesar's invasion of Italy. Thus, both generals are positioned on boundaries between outside and inside space and threaten to collapse them; Caesar by breaking the law and bringing in his army, and Pompey by bringing in the Parthians, thereby endangering the Empire and its values and habits. As such, Caesar's final invocation of Roma is heavily loaded: it represents the culmination of his invocations, aligns Rome with the other deities, but the connection with Pompey's dangerous request for Parthian assistance in Book 8 also underlines both the willingness of both generals to employ war and treaty rituals in ways that endanger the Roman state.

So Caesar, standing on the border of Italy, invokes a selection of gods that, in addition to prefiguring the Julio-Claudian dynasty, recalls early Roman times in which there was a great concern with (fetial) ritual war preparations, negotiations and treaty solemnizations. Caesar seems to be evoking these rituals in order to legitimize his 'enterprise' (*coeptis*, 1.200): his civil war against Pompey and the Roman Republic. Caesar then continues this diplomatic effort by stating his complaints and demands, an action typically part of the *rerum repetitio*.[56] The second part of his speech consists mostly of a justification for his imminent attack on Rome, an (implied) demand to continue as *miles* rather than as citizen, and an assignment of guilt to Pompey, who, Caesar complains, is the one who has made him into Rome's enemy (1.200–3):

non te furialibus armis
persequor: en, adsum **victor terraque marique**
Caesar, **ubique tuus (liceat modo, nunc quoque) miles**.
ille erit ille nocens, qui me tibi fecerit hostem.

Not with impious weapons
do I pursue you – here am I, Caesar, conqueror by land and sea,
your own soldier everywhere, now too if I am permitted.
The man who makes me your enemy, it is he will be the guilty one.

Caesar actively refrains from a belligerent attitude whilst justifying his war declaration. He emphasizes the defensive nature of his actions: he is not attacking his *patria* in frantic warfare (1.200), but Pompey is forcing him to declare war on Rome (*ille nocens*, 1.203).[57] Simultaneously, his language is militant and betrays his intentions: he describes himself as *victor* (1.201) and *miles* (1.202).

[55] Rossi (2000) discusses Pompey's journey from Italy to the East in the *Civil War* as an inverted parallel of Aeneas's journey from the East to Latium, one of several ways in which the poem shows geographical disorder (see n. 52).

[56] Cf. Livy 1.32.6–7; Dion. Hal. 2.72.6.

[57] In reaction to *Patria*'s emphasis on Caesar's transgression of the law (1.190–2), Caesar's speech contains legal language too. By calling Pompey *nocens*, a word strongly associated with crime and guilt (cf. *OLD*, s.v. *nocens* 2), he transforms himself from an active agent waging an unlawful war to a man forced to embark on this war justifiably. Cf. Willis (2011).

Yet Caesar is still concerned with fighting a just war. The words *victor terraque marique* (1.201) evoke the formula describing Augustus's practice of establishing peace through military victory.[58] This, in addition to Quirinus's invocation earlier, suggests that Lucan's Caesar seeks to justify his actions by aligning his advance on Rome with Augustus's later pacification of the Roman Empire. The essential difference is that Caesar's empire has not been pacified yet. Rather, Caesar is on a mission to achieve this goal, and now indirectly asks *Patria* for permission (*liceat modo*, 1.202) to continue his quest by marching on Rome as a soldier: a justifying demand that could be seen as the demands characteristic of the *rerum repetitio*.

In the second part of his speech, then, Caesar represents himself as serving the interests of Italy and his actions as necessary for the pacification of the Republic. Soon after, however, he abandons his diplomatic efforts. At first, he appears to cross the river hastily (1.204–5): he carries his military standards across the Rubicon, explicitly going against *Patria*'s request and signaling that he is going to war. Caesar does not allow *Patria* to reply anymore, either: rather, through his engagement with fetial war and treaty rituals, he has provided himself with the position of authority and justification typical of the Romans' (fetial) relations with other peoples:[59] *ille*, Pompey, is endangering the Republic, and therefore Caesar is authorized to wage his war.

As mentioned earlier, diplomacy affects the pace of the narrative in Caesar's own works in different ways: diplomatic efforts are often accompanied by long speeches, but there is more emphasis on physical actions when negotiations are finished, or when they seem pointless from the start.[60] Lucan's Caesar behaves rather similarly: his speeches dramatically slow down the rapid narrative tempo with which he passed over the Alps, and his behaviour at the Rubicon can be seen as a diplomatic effort. When his diplomatic 'negotiation' is finished – at least from Caesar's point of view – he undertakes action by physically crossing the Rubicon. Lucan's Caesar therefore corresponds to Caesar's Caesar in the sense that both are characterized by *celeritas* and a diplomatic approach to problems. This enables them to represent war as efficient and manageable, thereby selling war as a necessity.[61] In Caesar's *Civil War*, however, Caesar does describe further communication between him and Pompey through legates and emphasizes his willingness to settle the dispute and solemnize their potential agreement with an oath (*BCiv*. 1.8–9).[62] In this particular instance, then, Lucan rewrites Caesar-the-author. This minimalizes and complicates Caesar's diplomatic efforts and underlines the closed nature of Caesar-the-protagonist's so-called negotiation with *Patria*, which in turn highlights the difficulties associated with the justification of this civil war.

[58] Aug. *RG* 13: *cum per totum imperium populi Romani* ***terra marique*** *esset parta* ***victoriis*** *pax*, 'whenever there was peace, secured by victory, throughout the whole domain of the Roman people on land and sea'. Cf. also Livy 1.19.3 (Augustus closing the 'Gates of War').

[59] A war would be considered just when a formal war declaration had been made by the *fetiales*, but the Romans generally allowed their enemies little or no opportunity to negotiate on this decision (Ager (2009: 21–2), Cornwell (2015: 335–7)).

[60] Adema (2016: 225 and 2017: 237–9). See above, p. 163.

[61] Adema (2017: 238).

[62] Cf. also Cass. Dio 41.5–6.

But Lucan's Caesar does not have the final say: the Italian landscape voices its concerns as well, as the Rubicon protests Caesar's crossing by swelling up (*tumidumque per amnem*, 1.204). So Italy protests Caesar's advance through the medium of landscape, rather than through legal or verbal means, as *Patria*'s apparition did.

The Rubicon's swelling does not hinder Caesar, and rivers will not form an obstacle for the general in the rest of the poem. As a result, at least from Caesar's point of view, spatial boundaries no longer make the legal distinction between Rome's *hostes* and *cives*: Rome has lost her power to organize space,[63] and incidentally, her spatial model of identity. Thus, Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon instigates the motif of geographic and political disorder as recurrent throughout the *Bellum Civile*.

6 Abandoning treaties and seeking war

After Caesar's speech, fetial war and treaty rituals are still implicitly present in the passage. Caesar's hurried crossing of the river is followed by a simile in which he is compared to a lion that, opposed by an enemy, gathers his rage and attacks his foe despite being wounded (1.205–12). This simile is part of a tradition of epic similes wherein a (wounded) lion opposes a foe and becomes angrier.[64] A wounded lion particularly relevant to my argument is found in Virgil's *Aeneid*.

Following his ally Camilla's death and the subsequent bloodbath between the Trojans and the Latins, Turnus approaches King Latinus with a request for single combat between himself and Aeneas. He is then compared to a wounded lion (Verg. *Aen*. 12.4–8). This request for single combat is followed up by the solemnization of a treaty between king Latinus and Aeneas, which contains several elements familiar from fetial ritual: a verbal formula required for striking (fetial) treaties and making vows,[65] preparations for the solemnization with priests wearing *verbena*, sacred boughs,[66] and invocations of fetial gods, mainly by Latinus.[67] However, these particular gods were typically not called upon

[63] Willis (2011: 58–78).

[64] Roche (2009: 216). Cf. Hom. *Il*. 5.136–43, 20.164–73; Verg. *Aen*. 9.792–6, 12.4–9; Lucan, *BC* 1.205–12; V. Fl. *Arg*. 3.587–9.

[65] Verg. *Aen*. 12.13: *concipe foedus*. Cf. *OLD*, s.v. *concipio* 12b. In his commentary, Tarrant (2012: 89) notes that *concipere foedus* as 'striking' a treaty only occurs here and in 12.158 (*conceptumque excute foedus*: 'Destroy the treaty that has been struck', referring to the same treaty). Tarrant argues that it could be a legitimate technical term, following the expression *concipere bellum*, but does not mention the *fetiales*. Instances of *concipere* suggesting a connection with the fetial priesthood include Var. *Ling*. 5.86 (*iustum conciperetur bellum* in a discussion of fetial war declaration); Livy 1.32.8 (*concipiendique iuris iurandi* when describing *rerum repetitio*), 5.25.7 (*conceptum votum* when describing a vow), 7.7.5 (*quae ipse concepisset verba iuraret*, again when describing a vow).

[66] Verg. *Aen*. 12.118–20. For *verbena* and the fetials, cf. Ogilvie (1965: 111), Rüpke (1990: 101–3), and Livy 1.24.6, 30.43.10; Plin. *HN* 22.3; Serv. 12.120.

[67] Verg. *Aen*. 12.197–202: Latinus invokes the earth, Janus, the gods of the Underworld, and Jupiter who punishes oath breakers with his thunderbolt. This corresponds to the invocations of celestial and infernal gods, Jupiter and Janus Quirinus (Livy 1.32.6–7; Dion. Hal. 2.72.6). The association with fetial ritual is strengthened further by the presence of *audiat* in Latinus's *audiat haec genitor qui foedera fulmine sancit* (12.200), as Livy uses *audire* in prayers exclusively pertaining to fetial ritual (Hickson (1993: 115–17)). Cf. Livy 1.24.7, 1.32.6, 32.10.

in treaty rituals, but in war declarations: Aeneas and Latinus appear to use a conflation of elements from both fetial rituals.[68] Additionally, Latinus swears by his infertile sceptre (Verg. *Aen.* 12.206–7). Perhaps this sceptre can be associated with the infertile spear that was hurled at the enemy after the war had been officially declared. After all, Livy (1.32.12) describes the fetial spear as *sanguineam*, an adjective derived from a species of cornel that is considered to be infertile by Macrobius (*Sat*. 3.20.3) and Pliny (*HN* 16.74, 176).[69] Maybe Latinus's oath already hints at the treaty's eventual failure: soon after the treaty's solemnization, war breaks loose when the Rutulian Tolumnius hurls a (fetial) spear towards the Trojans and there is an outbreak of fighting between both parties.[70]

Thus, this Virgilian treaty, leading to the eventual fusion of the Trojans and Latins into one Roman people – but only *after* the treaty is temporarily broken for a proto-civil war – comes across rather ambiguously. The conflation of elements of several fetial rituals reflects on the unjustifiable aspects of the proto-civil war between the Trojans and the Latins as opposed to a *bellum iustum* between Romans and an enemy. Lucan's simile, in which Caesar is likewise compared to an angered and injured lion, recalls this Virgilian lion simile and its associated narrative of war beginnings and broken treaties. Perhaps, then, Lucan's simile suggests that the civil war between Caesar and Pompey is like the proto-civil war between Trojans and Latins: necessary to unify the Roman people, but emblematic of the violence this unification is based on.[71]

Caesar's definite rejection of treaties becomes clear in his next speech, which takes place as soon as he reaches Italy's riverbanks. Following a description of the Rubicon that emphasizes its nature as a boundary,[72] Caesar announces that he is abandoning peace and seeking war instead (1.225–7):

> 'hic,' ait, 'hic pacem temerataque iura relinquo;
> te, Fortuna, sequor. procul hinc iam foedera sunto;
> credidimus satis <his>, utendum est iudice bello.'

> And [he] said: 'Here I abandon peace and desecrated law;
> Fortune, it is you I follow. Farewell to treaties from now on;
> I have relied on them for long enough; now war must be our referee.'

[68] Tarrant (2012: 132) suggests that Virgil does not follow the fetial ritual for making a treaty too closely, 'perhaps wishing to avoid pedantry or blatant anachronism'.

[69] Scholars have interpreted the throwing of a spear into the hostile territory as symbolical (McDonald and Walbank (1937), Rüpke (1990: 107–8)) or magical (Ogilvie: 1965: 135): made from infertile cornel and tipped with iron, the spear would attract and render infertile the enemy's potency.

[70] The hurling of the spear also recalls Pandarus's breaking of the treaty with the Greeks (Verg. *Aen*. 5.496–7; Hom. *Il*. 4.68–126), and Laocoon throwing a spear at the Trojan Horse's belly (Verg. *Aen*. 2.50–2 – not mentioned in the *Iliad*). Tarrant (2012: 156–7) notes that Tolumnius's spear is 'almost certainly' an allusion to the fetial practice of declaring war by casting a spear into the enemy's territory. Tolumnius's name also evokes Lars Tolumnius of Veii, who broke a treaty with the Romans by killing four of their legates and was consequently killed by Cornelius Cossus (Holland (1935: 211), Tarrant (2012: 155); cf. Livy 4.17–19).

[71] On the unifying role of violence in the Roman state in Lucan, see Connolly (2016).

[72] Cf. 1.213–22: *et Gallica certus* | *limes ab Ausoniis disterminat arva colonis* ('and [the Rubicon] separates the Gallic | fields from the farmers of Ausonia, a fixed boundary').

Caesar rejects treaties and officially declares war in a kind of *indictio belli*. He defends his hurried action by pointing out that legality has been scorned already anyway (*temerataque iura*, 1.225).[73] What does it matter, then, if Caesar himself does not play by the rules? Caesar specifically denounces *foedera* (1.226), with a phrase that recalls the doomed peace treaty between Aeneas and Latinus that I discussed earlier.[74] Caesar possibly refers to the disrupted triumvirate (*rupto foedere regni*, 1.4), or to a potential peace treaty with Italy – which, at this point, was not a real option anymore, as Caesar's speeches indicate. Only the war itself will decide who is on the right side of history.

The speech is followed by another simile, in which Caesar's swiftness is compared to a sling-bullet and an arrow (1.228–30):

> sic fatus noctis tenebris rapit agmina ductor
> impiger, et torto Balearis verbere fundae
> ocior et missa Parthi post terga sagitta, . . .

> With these words, the leader pushed his army through night's darkness
> tirelessly, swifter than the whirled thong of Balearic sling
> or the Parthian's arrow shot over his shoulder, . . .

Keeping in mind the recurring elements of fetial ritual and the concern with proper beginnings and endings of war in this passage, the reader might think of the ritual casting of the spear that completed the fetial war declaration and officially opened the war. Although Caesar is not compared to a spear directly, the bullet and arrow are comparable images that fulfil a similar purpose, especially since the simile accompanies the general's war opening and advance on Ariminum. Perhaps Caesar is likened specifically to a Balearic sling and a Parthian arrow rather than a spear because the *hasta* was a quintessentially Roman weapon.[75] Caesar's Roman identity is complicated throughout the passage anyway: he has just spent a decade in Gaul, and the inhabitants of Ariminum soon complain that they are always the first to witness the attacks of barbarians.[76] As such, Lucan's simile underlines Caesar's status as Rome's enemy – whereas Caesar himself has just characterized *Pompey* as Rome's enemy – and complicates his Roman identity.[77] Caesar claims to be fighting in the interest of *Patria*, but what does being Roman even mean anymore now that he has crossed the Rubicon and set in motion civil war and the decentralization of the Republic?

---

[73] Perhaps referring to the disintegration of the triumvirate, or the senate's manoeuvres, including the expulsion of Antony and Curio on 7 January in 49 BCE. See Roche (2009: 220–1) for a summary of interpretations.

[74] Roche (2009: 221) with Verg. *Aen*. 12.202–3: *nulla dies pacem hanc Italis nec foedera rumpet, | quo res cumque cadent*: 'No time shall break this peace and truce for Italy, however things befall.'

[75] Helbig (1908), Alföldi (1959), Rüpke (1990: 108).

[76] Cf. 1.248–57.

[77] For Caesar's attack on Rome as an attack by barbarian peoples, cf. also 1.483–4.

7 Conclusion

I have demonstrated that Lucan's Rubicon passage shows Caesar briefly slowing down to justify his crossing of the Rubicon and his undertaking of civil war by evoking Roman rituals of war and treaty solemnization. From the perspective of the Romans, these rituals typically justified their wars against others, but in this case, the rituals are applied to a war between Romans. The application of these Roman rituals of war to a civil war – both by Caesar in this passage, but also by Pompey in Book 8, as we have seen – therefore highlights a great problem. If both parties are Roman, which side is more justified in its actions?

The interactions between Caesar and the Italian landscape in this passage illustrate this issue. While Caesar evokes Roman rituals of war and thereby acts in the name of preserving the traditional Roman order and its laws, he does not give *Patria* an opportunity to respond. This is not an open negotiation, but an employment of rituals enacted by Caesar to provide himself with the authority to advance on Rome and to use military force against fellow Romans. Yet we have also seen that the Italian landscape vehemently protests Caesar's advance on Rome: firstly, verbally, as *Patria*'s apparition reminds the general of the legal consequences of his actions, and secondly, physically, as the Rubicon swells up in an attempt to hinder Caesar's progress. It is clear that the Italian landscape does not see this as a justified war, despite Caesar's employment of aforementioned rituals.

The interactions between Caesar and the Italian landscape in the Rubicon passage are therefore characteristic of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, a war in which lawfulness has been conferred onto crime (*ius datumque sceleri*, 1.2), and in which it is impossible to know who took up weapons more justly (*quis iustius induit arma | scire nefas,* 1.126–7).[78] Only the outcome of the war will decide who is on the 'right' side of history. This is accomplished not only by the two generals, but by Romans themselves too: the greatness of Caesar is in their hands, as the general reminds his own troops before the battle of Pharsalus, and their fortunes are at stake here (7.253, 264–6). Just as the proto-civil war between the Trojans and Latins, and just as the civil conflict between Augustus and Mark Antony, then, this civil war between Caesar and Pompey is an undeniable part of the history of the Roman state, a history in which the reiterative violence of leaders and people repeatedly plays a unifying role.[79]

Bibliography

Adema, S. M. 2016. 'Encouraging Troops, Persuading Narratees: Pre-Battle Exhortations in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* as a Narrative Device.' In *The Art of History: Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*, edited by V. Liotsakis and S. Farrington, 219–39. Berlin: De Gruyter.

---

[78] Connolly (2016: 280), to whom I owe my understanding of reiterative violence in Lucan. On the powerlessness of law in wartime, cf. also 1.277, 1.348–9.

[79] Many thanks to Bettina Reitz-Joosse, Marian W. Makins and C. J. Mackie for organizing the Landscapes of War panel where the paper on which this chapter is based was originally presented, as well as for their feedback as volume editors. I am also thankful to my fellow panel participants for their helpful questions and comments.

Adema, S. M. 2017. *Speech and Thought in Latin War Narratives: Words of Warriors*. Leiden: Brill.

Ager, S. L. 2009. 'Roman Perspectives on Greek Diplomacy.' In *Diplomatics and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, edited by C. Eilers, 15–44. Leiden: Brill.

Ahl, F. 1976. *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Alföldi, A. 1959. 'Hasta – Summa Imperii: The Spear as Embodiment of Sovereignty in Rome.' *American Journal of Archaeology* 63 (1): 1–27.

Ambühl, A. 2016. 'Thessaly as an Intertextual Landscape of Civil War in Latin Poetry.' In *Valuing Landscape in Classical Antiquity: Natural Environment and Cultural Imagination*, edited by J. McInerney and I. Sluiter, 297–322. Leiden: Brill.

Asso, P., ed. 2011. *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. Leiden: Brill.

Beard, M., J. A. North and S. R. F. Price 1998. *Religions of Rome. Volume 1: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beck, H., A. Duplá, M. Jehne and F. P. Polo, eds. 2011. *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bexley, E. 2014. 'Lucan's Catalogues and the Landscape of War.' In *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic*, edited by M. Skempis and I. Ziogas, 373–403. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bienkowski, P. 1900. *De simulacris barbarum gentium apud Romanos: Corporis barbarorum prodromus*. Krakow: Academia litterarum Cracoviensis.

Braga, R. 2014. *La* lex de prouinciis praetoriis. *Aspetti notevoli e questioni aperte*. Milan: EduCatt.

Braund, S. H., trans. 2009. *Lucan. Civil War*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Campbell, B. and L. A. Tritle, eds. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Connolly, J. 2016. 'A Theory of Violence in Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*.' In *Wordplay and Powerplay in Latin Poetry*, edited by P. Mitsis and I. Ziogas, 273–98. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Cornwell, H. 2015. 'The Role of Peace-Makers (*caduceatores*) in Roman Attitudes to War and Peace.' In *Ancient Warfare: Introducing Current Research*, edited by G. Lee, H. Whittaker and G. Wrightson, 331–48. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cuntz, O. 1902. *Polybius und sein Werk*. Leipzig: Teubner.

DeBrohun, J. 2007. 'The Gates of War (and Peace): Roman Literary Perspectives.' In *War and Peace in the Ancient World*, edited by K. A. Raaflaub, 256–78. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Dinter, M. T. 2012. *Anatomizing Civil War: Studies in Lucan's Epic Technique*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Durry, M., ed. 1970. *Lucain: Sept Exposés suivis de Discussions*. Genève: Fondation Hardt.

Eilers, C., ed. 2009. *Diplomatics and Diplomacy in the Roman World*. Leiden: Brill.

Fantuzzi, M. and T. D. Papanghelis, eds. 2006. *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Brill: Leiden.

Feeney, D. C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fowler, W. W. 1899. *The Roman Festivals of the Republic: An Introduction to the Study of the Religion of the Romans*. London: Macmillan.

Gardner, P. 1888. 'Countries and Cities in Ancient Art.' *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 9: 47–81.

Gowing, A. M. 2005. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grandazzi, A. 2008. *Alba Longa, histoire d'une légende: Recherches sur l'archéologie, la religion, les traditions de l'ancien Latium*. Rome: École française de Rome.

Grimal, P. 1970. 'Le Poète et l'Histoire.' In *Lucain: Sept Exposés suivis de Discussions*, edited by M. Durry, 51–118. Genève: Fondation Hardt.

Hardie, P. 2006. 'Cultural and Historical Narratives in Virgil's *Eclogues* and Lucretius.' In *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*, edited by M. Fantuzzi and T. D. Papanghelis, 275–300. Brill: Leiden.
Hardy, E. G. 1916. 'The Transpadane Question and the Alien Act of 65 or 64 B.C.' *Journal of Roman Studies* 6: 63–82.
Helbig, W. 1908. *Zur Geschichte der* hasta donatica. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
Hickson, F. V. 1993. *Roman Prayer Language: Livy and the* Aeneid *of Virgil*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
Holland, L. A. 1935. 'Place Names and Heroes in the *Aeneid*.' *American Journal of Philology* 56 (3): 202–15.
Holland, L. A. 1961. *Janus and the Bridge*. Rome: American Academy in Rome.
Horsfall, N. 2000. *Virgil, Aeneid 7.* Leiden: Brill.
Hughes, J. D. 2013. 'Warfare and Environment in the Ancient World.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World*, edited by B. Campbell and L. A. Tritle, 128–42. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Jaeger, M. 1997. *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Konstan, D. 1986. 'Narrative and Ideology in Livy: Book 1.' *Classical Antiquity* 5 (2): 198–215.
Leach, E. W. 1974. *Vergil's Eclogues*: *Landscapes of Experience*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Lee, G., H. Whittaker and G. Wrightson, eds. 2015. *Ancient Warfare: Introducing Current Research*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Leigh, M. 2010. 'Lucan's Caesar and the Sacred Grove: Deforestation and Enlightenment in Antiquity.' In *Lucan*, edited by C. Tesoriero, 201–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lintott, A. W. 1971. 'Lucan and the History of Civil War.' *Classical Quarterly* 21 (2): 488–505.
Lintott, A. W. 1981. 'What was the Imperium Romanum?' *Greece & Rome* 28 (1): 53–67.
Liotsakis, V. and S. Farrington, eds. 2016. *The Art of History: Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Luke, T. S. 2014. *Ushering in a New Republic: Theologies of Arrival at Rome in the First Century BCE*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mayer, R. 1981. *Lucan.* Civil War *VIII*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
McDonald, A. H. and F. W. Walbank 1937. 'The Origins of the Second Macedonian War.' *Journal of Roman Studies* 27 (2): 180–207.
McInerney, J. and I. Sluiter, eds. 2016. *Valuing Landscape in Classical Antiquity: Natural Environment and Cultural Imagination*. Leiden: Brill.
Mitsis, P. and I. Ziogas, eds. 2016. *Wordplay and Powerplay in Latin Poetry*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Mommsen, T. 1863. *The History of Rome*, trans. W. P. Dickson. London: Richard Bentley.
Morrell, K. 2015. 'Cato, Caesar, and the Germani.' *Antichthon* 49: 73–93.
Mulhern, E. V. 2017. 'Roma(na) Matrona.' *Classical Journal* 112 (4): 432–59.
Myers, M. Y. 2011. 'Lucan's Poetic Geographies: Center and Periphery in Civil War Epic.' In *Brill's Companion to Lucan*, edited by P. Asso, 399–415. Leiden: Brill.
Nicolet, C. 1991. *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1–5*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
O'Gorman, E. 1995. 'Shifting Ground: Lucan, Tacitus and the Landscape of Civil War.' *Hermathena* 158: 117–31.
Östenberg, I. 2009. *Staging the World: Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ostrowski, J. A. 1996. 'Personifications of Countries and Cities as a Symbol of Victory in Greek and Roman Art.' In *Griechenland und Rom: Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Entwicklungstendenzen und Höhepunkten der antiken Geschichte, Kunst und Literatur*, edited by E. G. Schmidt, 264–72. Erlangen: Universitätsverlag Tbilissi.

Pasqualini, A., ed. 1996. *Alba Longa: Mito, Storia, Archeologia: Atti dell'Incontro di Studio Roma Albano Laziale, 27–29 gennaio 1994*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica.

Peer, A. 2015. *Julius Caesar's Bellum Civile and the Composition of a New Reality*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Powell, A. 2009. 'Julius Caesar and the Presentation of Massacre.' In *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*, edited by K. Welch and A. Powell, 111–38. London: Duckworth.

Raaflaub, K. A., ed., 2007. *War and Peace in the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Rasmus Brandt, J. and J. W. Iddeng, eds. 2012. *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reitz-Joosse, B. 2016. 'Land at Peace and Sea at War: Landscape and the Memory of Actium in Greek Epigrams and Propertius' *Elegies*.' In *Valuing Landscape in Classical Antiquity: Natural Environment and Cultural Imagination*, edited by J. McInerney and I. Sluiter, 276–96. Leiden: Brill.

Rich, J. 1976. *Declaring War in the Roman Republic in the Period of Transmarine Expansion*. Brussels: Latomus.

Rich, J. 2011. 'The *Fetiales* and Roman International Relations.' In *Priests and State in the Roman World*, edited by J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo, 187–242. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Rich, J. 2013. 'Roman Rituals of War.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World*, edited by B. Campbell and L. A. Tritle, 542–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, J. H. and F. Santangelo, eds. 2011. *Priests and State in the Roman World*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Ridley, R. T. 2000. 'The Dictator's Mistake: Caesar's Escape from Sulla.' *Historia* 49 (2): 211–29.

Rimell, V. 2015. *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics: Empire's Inward Turn*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roche, P. A. 2009. *Lucan: De Bello Civili, Book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Romm, J. S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Rosen, R. M. and I. Sluiter, eds. 2006. *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organisation of Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill.

Rossi, A. 2000. 'The *Aeneid* Revisited: The Journey of Pompey in Lucan's *Pharsalia*.' *American Journal of Philology* 121 (4): 571–91.

Rüpke, J. 1990. *Domi Militiae: Die religiöse Konstruktion des Krieges in Rom*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Rüpke, J. 2008. *Fasti Sacerdotum: A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499*, trans. D. M. B. Richardson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Samter, E. 1909. 'Fetiales.' In *Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edited by G. Wissowa 6 (2): 2259–65.

Santangelo, F. 2008. 'The Fetials and their "Ius".' *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 51: 63–93.

Saulnier, C. 1980. 'Le role des prêtres fétiaux et l'application du *ius fetiale* à Rome.' *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 58: 171–99.

Schilling, R. 1960. 'Janus. Le dieu introducteur. Le dieu des passages.' *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 72: 89–131.

Schmidt, E. G., ed. 1996. *Griechenland und Rom: Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Entwicklungstendenzen und Höhepunkten der antiken Geschichte, Kunst und Literatur*. Erlangen: Universitätsverlag Tbilissi.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 2009. *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri X*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Simón, F. M. 2011. 'The *Feriae Latinae* as Religious Legitimation of the Consuls' Imperium.' In *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, edited by H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne and F. P. Polo, 116–32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skempis, M. and I. Ziogas, eds. 2014. *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Skoie, M. 2006. 'City and Countryside in Vergil's *Eclogues.*' In *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organisation of Value in Classical Antiquity*, edited by R. M. Rosen and I. Sluiter, 297–325. Leiden: Brill.

Smith, C. J. 2012. 'The *Feriae Latinae.*' In *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice*, edited by J. Rasmus Brandt and J. W. Iddeng, 267–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spencer, D. 2005. 'Lucan's Follies: Memory and Ruin in a Civil-War Landscape.' *Greece & Rome* 52 (1): 46–69.

Spencer, D. 2010. *Roman Landscape: Culture and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Springer, L. A. 1954. 'The Cult and Temple of Jupiter Feretrius.' *Classical Journal* 50 (1): 27–32.

Sumi, G. S. 2002. 'Spectacles and Sulla's Public Image.' *Historia* 51 (4): 414–32.

Tarrant, R. J. 2012. *Virgil. Aeneid Book XII.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, L. R. 1941. 'Caesar's Early Career.' *Classical Philology* 36 (2): 113–32.

Tellegen-Couperus, O., ed. 2012. *Law and Religion in the Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill.

Thorne, M. 2011. '*Memoria Redux*: Memory in Lucan.' In *Brill's Companion to Lucan*, edited by P. Asso, 363–81. Leiden: Brill.

Walbank, F. W. 1957. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Walbank, F. W. 1972. 'Nationality as a Factor in Roman History.' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 76: 145–68.

Welch, K. and A. Powell, eds. 2009. *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*. London: Duckworth.

Wiedemann, T. 1986. 'The *Fetiales*: A Reconsideration.' *Classical Quarterly* 36: 478–90.

Willis, I. 2011. *Now and Rome: Lucan and Vergil as Theorists of Politics and Space*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd edn. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Ziegler, K.-H. 1972. 'Das Völkerrecht der römischen Republik.' *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 1 (2): 68–114.

Zientek, L. 2014. 'Lucan's Natural Questions: Landscape and Geography in the *Bellum Civile*.' PhD diss., University of Washington.

Zollschan, L. 2009. 'Review of: *Fasti Sacerdotum: A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499* by J. Rüpke.' *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2009.07.58 (available online: https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009.07.58, accessed 10 June 2020).

Zollschan, L. 2012. 'The Longevity of the Fetial College.' In *Law and Religion in the Roman Republic*, edited by O. Tellegen-Couperus, 119–44. Leiden: Brill.