Writing the English Republic

POETRY, RHETORIC AND POLITICS, 1627–1660

DAVID NORBROOK

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA http://www.cup.org
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

First published 1999

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Adobe Minion 10/12.5pt *System* QuarkXPress® [SE]

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

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data
Norbrook, David, 1950–
Writing the English Republic: poetry, rhetoric, and politics, 1627–1660 / David Norbrook.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0 521 63275 7 (hardback)
1. English poetry – Early modern, 1500–1700 – History and criticism.
2. Great Britain – History – Civil War, 1642–1649 – Literature and the war.
3. Rhetoric – Political aspects – Great Britain – History – 17th century.
4. Politics and literature – Great Britain – History – 17th century.
5. Milton, John, 1608–1674 – Political and social views.
6. Republicanism – Great Britain – History – 17th century.
7. Political poetry, English – History and criticism. 8. Great Britain –
Politics and government – 1625–1649. 9. Great Britain – Politics and government –
1649–1660. 10. English poetry – Roman influences. 11. Republicans in literature.
I. Title.
PR545.H5N67 1998
821′.409358 – dc21 98-3856 CIP

ISBN 0 521 63275 7 hardback

Contents

Illustrations

1

Lucan and the poetry of civil war

Politics and poetry in the *Pharsalia*

In July 1642, England stood on the brink of civil war. The king had withdrawn from London and there had been a long war of 'paper bullets', opposing political manifestoes, with each side accusing the other of subverting the constitution. One of the leading Parliamentarians, Bulstrode Whitelocke, rose in the House of Commons to warn of the dangers ahead. He quoted from the beginning of Lucan's *Pharsalia*:

> Bella per Emathios plus quam civilia campos,
> Iusque datum sceleri canimus, populumque potentem
> In sua victrici conversum viscera dextra[.]
> Warres more then civill on Æmathian plaines
> We sing: rage licens'd; where great Rome distaines
> In her owne bowels her victorious swords[.] (May, sig. A1r)[1]

This was one of the most celebrated passages of classical poetry. The first book of Lucan's epic of the Roman civil wars offered a gory flashback to the carnage and savagery of the civil tumults in Rome under Marius and Sulla, only to prepare the way for a narrative of an even more gory conflict. Whitelocke's quotation could, then, be taken as a bid for peace and reconciliation. Undoubtedly it served as a warning. The dangers of civil war had been a recurrent theme of Elizabethan and Jacobean literature, and continued in the 1630s to preoccupy court poetry, which contrasted England's peace with the devastation of the Thirty Years' War on the Continent.

Whitelocke's quotation, however, was double-edged. He went on to

1 [Bulstrode Whitelocke], *Memorials of the English Affairs* (1682; w1986), p. 58, citing Lucan, *Pharsalia*, i.2–3. Citations unless otherwise stated are from the Loeb edition of *Lucan*, trans. J. D. Duff (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1928), and from *Lucan's Pharsalia*, second edition, trans. Thomas May (1631; 16888); this 'corrected' edition, however, introduces some errors, and I read 'distaines' (sheathes) from the 1627 edition, 16887. May's translation is given as the version best known to seventeenth-century readers, but in its attempts at literal fidelity it fails to do justice to Lucan's flair and wit. Of several recent translations, I would particularly recommend that by Jane Wilson Joyce (Ithaca and London, 1993).

declare that he did not support a tame resignation of their lives and liberties into the hands of their adversaries. While keeping the possibility of peace open, they must prepare for a just and necessary defence. Early in the war, Lucan was invoked in a similar context in a treatise dedicated to a leading Parliamentarian nobleman, the earl of Northumberland. The author urged the king to remedy evils by returning to Parliament and 'sheathing your sword in the scabbard ordeined for it, not in the Bowels of your owne deare People'. And he protested that 'this Bellum plusquam ciuile w^{ch} your party wageth is another Weight w^{ch} lieth heavy on all vertuous, & religious Soules'. As in Lucan, blame for the civil war was laid on high-flying monarchists who ruthlessly overrode constitutional precedent.[2] Around the same time, Sir William Waller wrote in a much-cited letter to his royalist adversary, Sir Ralph Hopton: 'That great God which is the searcher of my heart, knowes, with what a sad sence I goe upon this service, and with what a perfect hatred I detest this warr without an Enemie'.[3] Up to a point, this letter bears out the point made by so many revisionist historians, that the protagonists in the Civil War took up arms only with extreme reluctance. What has not been noticed by modern readers is that Waller is here quoting from the first book of the *Pharsalia*, where a panicking woman prophesies disaster and denounces 'bellum . . . sine hoste', a war without an enemy (i.682). As with the Whitelocke reference, one might expect the implication to be the need for a peaceful settlement. But in fact the context is one in which Waller refuses further negotiation; his sentence continues: 'but I looke upon it as Opus Domini, which is enough to silence all passion in mee. . . Wee are both upon the stage, and must act those parts, that are assigned us in this Tragedy.'[4]

If we are to understand the mentality of those who took up arms in the Parliamentary cause, some of whom were to become committed republicans, it is important to pay attention to texts which placed immediate political actions in a longer historical and imaginative perspective. Lucan was the central poet of the republican imagination, and his traces can be found again and again amongst leading Parliamentarians. Yet he has disappeared from sight in much modern literary history. We are constantly told of the importance for early modern poetry of the classical heritage as embodied in the poetry of Horace

2 'Regicola, Publicola', Alnwick Castle MS 538 22/3, unpaginated; cited by permission of His Grace the Duke of Northumberland.

3 Waller to Sir Ralph Hopton, 16 June 1643, facsimile reproduced in Mary Coate, *Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum 1642–1660* (1933; second edition, Truro, 1963), facing p. 77. The quotation (unattributed) gives its title to Richard Ollard's *This War Without an Enemy: A History of the English Civil Wars* (1976).

4 Waller believed that the English excelled all other nations, and notably the French, in writing tragedy, and there may have been a political dimension in his celebrating this truth-telling quality: Hartlib's 'Ephemerides', 1640, *HP*, 30/4/40A.

and Virgil, both of whom, with whatever subtle qualifications and sub-texts, ultimately celebrated the reign of Augustus. The dust jacket of the current Loeb edition still feels it necessary to apologize: Lucan's 'weighty verse, powerful rhetoric, sour satire, pungent sayings, and belief in a Cause have led readers from the middle ages to quite modern times to over-estimate him'. Reprehensible as such qualities may appear to a certain form of philological purism, they were calculated to fire the early modern period with enthusiasm. Lucan's reception was indeed more troubled than Virgil's precisely because his poetry was a frontal challenge to the norms of courtly writing; but he had his admirers, especially those who had other reasons for disaffection with the court. Samuel Hartlib, a friend of Sir William Waller and of many leading Parliamentarians, recorded in 1640 the opinion of a member of his circle that 'Lucan herin [i.e. in eloquence] hase shewen a Master-peece and should not bee thus slighted as hee is by ordinary Criticks'.[5] A reading of the *Pharsalia* can help us to understand why for Whitelocke and his allies, a civil war was a great evil but failure to fight in a civil war would be even worse. A poem charged with paradox, the *Pharsalia* at once denounces civil war and incites it.

Let us return to the passage cited by Whitelocke. Lucan's epic is sometimes entitled *De Bello Civili*, *The Civil War*, but already in his first line Lucan characteristically pushes beyond conventional expectations: these wars will be more than civil. The simplest meaning is that they also break family loyalties, Pompey and Caesar being kinsmen; and there is a characteristic pun on the sense of 'civil' as 'civilized, well-ordered'. The 'plus quam' also takes on wider connotations. The poet sings not just of a single civil war but of wars. He looks back to earlier conflicts, and forward to an ongoing struggle between the forces of liberty and empire, a struggle in which the writing, and reading, of his poem is involved. War is the traditional subject-matter of epic – Virgil's 'arma virumque', arms and the man – and poetry legitimizes the imperial victor. Here the 'man' is split into rival factions, and civil war is vividly imaged as a suicide. Physical breakdown is mirrored by linguistic breakdown. 'Iusque datum sceleri' is a reminder that the meaning of words like 'justice' can be controlled by physical force. This is not because language is naturally monarchical: on the contrary, political values and meanings established by some form of consent have given way to an anarchic competition of warlords until one of them, Caesar, has enough power to arrest the process. Anarchy and monarchy are different, equally arbitrary faces of the same phenomenon. The poem will constantly remind us that now that Caesar's party has triumphed, the victor has been able to rewrite history and redefine its words. What name, asks Lucan, will be given to the crime of murdering Pompey by those for whom the murder of Caesar was a sin (viii.609–10)? The question reveals his

5 *HP*, 30/4/44B.

awareness that by and large it is the emperors who control the names and their meanings.[6]

The narrator goes on to lament the squandering of energies that should have been devoted to defeating Rome's enemies, and gives a haunting image of the devastation that has been wrought on the Italian landscape:

> But now that walles of halfe fall'n houses so
> Hang in Italian Townes, vast stones we see
> Of ruin'd walles, whole houses empty be,
> And ancient Townes are not inhabited;
> That vntill'd Italy's with weedes orespread,
> And the neglected Plowes want labouring hands . . .
> (i.24–9; May, sig. A1v)

This passage inverts the panegyrics of imperial peace to be found in Augustan court poets like Virgil and Horace, for whom the Empire marked a renewal of the landscape. Lucan returns to this subversion of imperial imagery just before the climactic battle at Pharsalia:

> One towne receiues vs all, and bondmen till
> Th'Italian lands, old houses stand alone
> Rotten, and want a man to fall vpon:
> And wanting her old Citizens there slaine,
> Rome with the dreggs of men is fill'd againe.
> This slaughter makes that Rome hereafter free
> From civill war for many yeeres shall be. (vii.402–7; May, sig. M4v)

The final sentence is heavily ironic: the nation is so degraded that it lacks the spirit needed for civil war.

Having thus inverted the conventions of Augustan poetry, the poem now makes a sudden, startling reversal. All these evils, we are told, are more than compensated for by the fact that Nero is now the ruler:

> Let dire *Pharsalia* grone with armed Hoasts,
> And glut with blood the Carthaginian Ghosts . . .
> Yet much owes Rome to civill enmity
> For making thee our Prince[.] (i.38–9, 44–5; May, sig. A2r).

In a passage modelled on Virgil's praise of Augustus in the *Georgics*, Lucan looks forward to Nero's apotheosis in heaven, and cautions him not to sit anywhere other than the centre of the celestial sphere or his weight will bring it crashing down. In fact, the poet proclaims, to him Nero is divine already: no need to invoke Apollo or Bacchus as his Muse, the emperor himself is Muse

6 For a stimulating reading along these lines see John Henderson, 'Lucan/The Word at War', *Ramus* 16 (1987), 122–64.

enough. This passage disappointed some republican readers. The Leveller John Lilburne wrote that 'I should have doted on the *Roman Poet* of the *Civil Wars*, had I not found him blessing his Fates for bringing forth a *Nero* through those bitter Pangs and Throws.'[7] Lilburne was not, however, notably sensitive to irony, and most seventeenth-century commentators took it that this passage was 'meere Ironicall flattery'[8], a wicked parody of the ceremonial language of court poetry, with imperial and divine *gravitas* or weightiness being ludicrously literalized in the image of Nero's divine bulk ruining the cosmos. On that reading, Lucan's audacity is the more to be admired: it was very difficult for the Emperor to take offence without making himself look ludicrous.

If the panegyric of Nero is comparably ironic, in Lucan irony often mingles with tragedy. The image of cosmic dissolution is immediately taken up in the poet's analysis of the causes of the civil war. Rome, he declares, collapsed of its own weight; it had become too huge to stand any longer. Rome's fall conjures up images of the cosmos's reversion to chaos at the end of time. Lucan argues that the attempt by Pompey, Crassus and Caesar to divide the Roman world between them was doomed to failure, for as long as the sun goes round in its endless course, those who try to share power will end up trying to seize it. The cosmic analogies here are characteristically disorienting. First the narrator has imagined the cosmos collapsing under Nero's weight, then he uses its final collapse to image Rome's instability, then he contrasts its permanence with the instability of the republic. Within a few hundred lines we will be told that the sun hid its face and the earth stopped on its axis when Caesar advanced on Rome (i.543–53). Where imperial poetry aimed to assert a natural harmony between the state and the cosmos, here tenor and vehicle are dizzyingly unstable. There follows another striking oxymoron for the unstable union between the rival warlords Pompey, Caesar and Crassus: 'concordia discors' (i.98, 'iarring concord'; May, sig. A2v).[9] Although Lucan is at this point describing the breakdown of the republican system, he observes that such discord went back to the very founding of Rome, when Romulus killed Remus. For Lucan, then, there is no easy harmony between social order and cosmic order. The state is the product of human agency, and if its original design is flawed, the long-term consequences may be disastrous. Rome's central flaw is top-heaviness, with power being concentrated first in the triumvirate and then in the single figure of the emperor; the greater the weight at the top, the more precarious the building.

It thus becomes clear that this poem will not have an unambiguous hero; it

7 John Lilburne, *The Afflicted Mans Out-Cry* (1653; E711.7*), p. 5 (I owe this reference to Nigel Smith). 8 *Lucans Pharsalia*, trans. Sir Arthur Gorges (1614; 16884), p. 4.

9 The phrase had been used by the Augustan Horace in a more straightforward sense: Horace, *Epistles* 1.12.19.

is at once fiercely partisan and critically detached. The partisanship emerges in a celebrated line: 'Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni' (i.128), 'heaven approoues/The conquering cause; the conquerde *Cato* loues' (May, sig. A3r). The obtrusive alliteration gives an impression of judicious balance, yet this only intensifies the audacity of valuing a human against the gods. For as the poem will make clear, the gods chose the less just side, and Lucan's narrator repeatedly denounces Caesar's party and champions Pompey's. It is also clear from the start, however, that this is only the lesser of two evils. The famous character-sketches of Caesar and Pompey which now follow (i.129–57) complicate our sympathies. Pompey's military ambitions were suspect, but he has now abandoned them for the sake of easy popularity: 'plausuque sui gaudere theatri', 'his Theaters loud shout/Was his delight' (i.133; May, sig. A3r). Besides alluding to the theatre that Pompey had constructed, the phrase conveys an image of Pompey as a being of surfaces, acting out his own fantasies, and this impression is reinforced by the words: 'Stat magni nominis umbra', 'And stood the shadow of a glorious name' (i.135; May, sig. A3r). This is a characteristic play on words: Lucan consistently describes Pompey by the title he had been awarded by the bloody dictator Sulla, 'Magnus'. As the poem continues, our sense of just what greatness consists in will become complicated; at this point Pompey has lost his older greatness without finding a new, inner greatness in the service of liberty. He is compared to an old oak whose roots have rotted to instability: again, an image from the natural world which might be expected to connote stability conveys the reverse. Meanwhile, Caesar, while lacking a traditional 'nomen' (i.144), has the 'virtus' or violent energy required to rush into the Roman power vacuum; Lucan compares him to lightning, a mysterious force which is never contained in a single place. The image makes him merely destructive, and there can be no question of favouring his cause as just, but Lucan has made his Pompey more of an anti-hero than a conventional epic hero. Cato himself joins in the war mainly to prevent Pompey from becoming as bad a tyrant as Caesar, and is aware that historical conditions make possible the recovery of no more than the shadow of freedom (ii.303). The narrator proceeds to denounce even Cato as motivated by an excessive desire for civil war (ii.325).

Lucan was indeed so disrespectful to epic convention that he was often criticized for being more of a historian than a poet. Behind that charge, however, lay an unease with the poem's politics.[10] If Lucan champions history, it is because of his violent resistance to the myths in which Augustan poets had clothed the triumph of the imperial dynasty. Lucan's is a sharply demystifying poetry, and after his sketch of his protagonists he proceeds to set their

10 Gerald M. MacLean, *Time's Witness: Historical Representation in English Poetry, 1603–1660* (Madison and London, 1990), pp. 26ff, 34.

qualities in a larger social context, analyzing the breakdown of civic virtue in Rome (i.158–82). He lays heavy blame on the quest for excessive wealth, including the enlargement of agrarian estates and their sale to foreign owners (i.160–70). The 'greatness' of Pompey and Caesar is thus a reflection of a nation's moral degeneration. The first book continues with a shameful chronicle of defeatism. Caesar's advance over the Rubicon and towards Rome is greeted by panic and despair; Pompey flees the city; and the book ends with a series of grim prophetic visions of the defeat of the republican cause. The scholar Figulus warns that:

> it bootes vs not to craue
> A peace: with peace a master [domino] we shall haue.
> Draw out the series of thy misery,
> O Rome, to longer yeares, now onely free
> From [i.e. because of, during] civill warre. (i.669–73; May, sig. B3r)

'Dominus' is for Lucan a loathsome word, signifying the decline from citizenship to subjection, to being subordinate to the will of a single person. Peace, the normal hoped-for outcome of an epic poem, is here ironically revealed as even worse than the civil war that preceded it.

Civil war, then, emerges from the poem as a disaster, and yet again and again these terrors are invoked only in order to make the point that the imperial peace is even worse. Terrible as the war was, the narrator reproaches the republicans for having failed to fight it better, and thus blighted the lives of posterity. He looks back disconsolately to a moment when Pompey's scruples made him hold back from victory: had he won, Rome might have been 'libera regum', 'free of kings' (vi.301; perhaps from political caution, May, K7r, omits 'of kings'). After the defeat at Pharsalia, the narrator laments:

> These swords subdue all ages that shall serue.
> Alas what could posterity deserue
> To be in thraldome borne? fought we with feare?
> Spar'd we our throates? the punishment we beare
> Of others flight. To vs, that since doe liue,
> Fates should giue war, if they a tyrant giue. (vii.641–6; May, sigs. M8r–v)

But his generation are denied an opportunity to fight the old battles anew. Liberty has withdrawn beyond the Rhine, never to return (vii.433).

Lucan projects this sense of an irreversibly lost historical opportunity back on to Pompey's contemporaries: they lament that they were not born in the age of real heroism, of the Punic Wars (ii.45–6). The poem has a recessive structure, with the real liberty for which it mourns receding into the past. Cato, the most unequivocally virtuous hero of the poem, has no illusions about Pompey. There may be a tinge of impatient irony in Lucan's exaggerated presentation of Cato's own virtues. He belongs to a generation for whom the

values of the old republic are so remote that however much they might hate the present, it was hard to think of recovering the past without a certain nervous embarrassment.[11] The more devastating the picture of the calamitous effects of the loss of liberty, the harder it was to believe that a single individual could somehow transcend that process, could recover a pure republican language from the debased language of transactions at the imperial court.

One of the poem's crucial moments – often recalled during the English Civil War – is Caesar's raid on the state treasury, a classic instance of the subordination of the common good to personal will: 'Rome then first then *Caesar* poorer was' (iii.168; May, sig. D6v). When the tribune Metellus tries to take a stand, a colleague counsels against resistance on the paradoxical ground that liberty can only be preserved by losing it; even the shadow is better than nothing:

> The freedome of men subjugated dyes,
> By freedomes selfe (quoth he) whose shadow thou
> Shalt keepe, if all his proud commands thou doo. (iii.145–7; May, sig. D6v)

Lucan is writing at the end of a long series of such compromises, trading in the substance of liberty for residual shadows. The Roman republic is the last vestige of republicanism throughout the ancient world, so that in extinguishing it Caesar is suppressing 'The worlds last liberty' (vii.579–81; May, sig. M7v). Opposition slowly becomes stifled into silence (v.31); kings have even stopped the mouths of the gods by closing down oracles (v.114). The grisly scene in which the witch Erictho tries to prophesy the future by briefly reanimating a recently dead corpse (vi.750ff) glances at Lucan's own scepticism about the possibility of recovering past voices. However much he may dream of reviving the rhetorical world of Cicero and Brutus, republican rhetoric in his own day seems destined to remain impotent.

In fact, while the poem makes the conventional epic claims for its own immortality, it is shot through with anxiety that true republican voices will be drowned out by the pompous mechanisms of imperial praise. In reciting lines from his own poem while he was dying – a moment illustrated on the title-page of May's translation (figure 2) – Lucan enacted the process by which republican poetry was suppressed by imperial power. The gesture's self-consciousness is indicated by the ways in which it is anticipated in the poem. The most poignant moment is the burial of Pompey's headless corpse on a bleak shore, with fire borrowed from a neighbouring pyre, and a four-word epitaph scrawled with a charred stick, his name inscribed so low that strangers have to stoop to read it (viii.793). The name is inscribed by Cremutius Cordus, an echo of the Cordus

11 On this point see W. R. Johnson, *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and his Heroes* (Ithaca and London, 1987), pp. 96ff.

whose history of the Roman civil wars had been burned on Tiberius's orders (an incident dramatized for the early modern period in Jonson's *Sejanus*).[12] Lucan may have drawn on now-lost books from Livy's history of Rome, a work which Augustus had tolerated even though its cult of liberty had republican implications; but it was no longer possible to undertake such a project in Lucan's day. He contrasts Cordus's fate with the temple built to the cruel tyrant Caesar in Rome (viii.835) and the magnificent pyramids of which the Egyptian kings are unworthy (viii.695). Pompey's son threatens to exhume the kings from their pyramids and send them down the Nile (ix.155). Though Cato restrains this political vandalism, the narrator himself later imagines an alternative future in which liberty has been recovered, and the tomb of that madman Alexander the Great, the image of monarchical futility, is preserved only for people to mock him (x.20).

Yet even that alternative future is mere wishful thinking, expressed in a past conditional tense ('libertas . . . si redderet', x.25). For the dynasties have in fact won out. Pompey's true refuge must be in the hearts of the virtuous republicans Cato and Brutus (ix.17–18). The poem enacts a gradual process of sublimation, in which the spirit of liberty becomes dissociated from physical embodiments. The meeting of the senators who have fled Rome is truer to the spirit of the republic than the coerced assembly held by Caesar in Rome (v.17ff). Caesar malevolently refuses to bury the republican dead, but the narrator declares that his spite is ultimately in vain, for their spirits will ascend to the heavens and Caesar will soar no higher. Though the dead may be denied a pyre, in the end all things will be consumed by fire. And those who lack a funeral urn are covered by the sky ('caelo tegitur, qui non habet urnam', vii. 819). Pompey's burial-place is in one sense universal, reaching as far as the Roman name (viii.795ff). It is in fact only in his death that his full greatness is released. Although the senate insist that they are not Pompey's party (v.13), as long as the battle is one between two great warlords, private interests will inevitably corrupt the public good. It is only when Pompey leaves the battlefield at Pharsalia that the cause fully transcends his own interests:

> The battels greatest part fought not for thee:
> Nor shall the honour'd name of *Pompey* be
> Wars quarrell now; the foes that still [i.e. always] will be
> 'Mongst vs, are *Caesar*, and Romes liberty:
> And twill appeare more plaine after thy flight
> Thy dying Senate for themselues did fight. (vii.693–7; May, sig. N1r)

After Pompey's death, the whole party is the party of freedom (ix.29–30), their goal being never to let any Caesar reign in peace (ix.90). Cato rebukes

12 Blair Worden, 'Ben Jonson among the Historians', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds.), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (1994), pp. 67–90.

the troops who want to give up now that Pompey is dead: if they were fighting only for Pompey, not for the cause, they were really defending tyranny (ix.257).

As the poem becomes more concerned with the cause in its purest form, its focus shifts towards Cato as the last great representative of the pure republican tradition. Where Virgil describes Aeneas as 'pius', alluding to his respect for tradition, Cato's 'virtus' is more rational and impersonal, implying a transcendence of the merely local.[13] He is given a powerful speech in which he declares that God is not to be found in particular shrines; all men partake of the divine (ix.573ff). In contrast, imperial architecture is shown as growing steadily more fixed and monumental. The reception given for Caesar by Cleopatra demonstrates a kind of oriental luxury which is not yet known at Rome – but will be introduced by the emperors (x.111–2).

These counterpointed themes of imperial monumentality and republican sublimity are concentrated in the remarkable passage where Caesar visits the ruins of Troy. The buildings are a reminder that no regal monument, however magnificent, will endure for ever; if no stone in this place is without a name (ix.973) it is because of Homer's poetic gifts. Caesar himself is only partially aware of this. He walks over the body of Hector without realizing it, and the guide has to rebuke him for his insensitivity. He proceeds to invoke the spirit of Aeneas, and offers to rebuild Troy. The man who has devoted himself to destroying Rome's liberties can identify himself with its founder. It is at this charged moment, which recalls Virgil's praise of Caesar, that the narrator himself directly addresses him:

> Oh great, and sacred worke of Poesy,
> That freest from fate, and giv'st eternity
> To mortall wights; but, *Caesar*, envy not
> Their living names, if Roman muses ought
> May promise thee, while *Homer's* honoured,
> By future times shall thou, and I be read;
> No age shall vs with darke oblivion staine,
> But our Pharsalia ever shall remaine.(ix.980–6; May, sig. R4v)

Normally a poet's claim of immortality is a promise, but in the light of Lucan's savage attacks on Caesar, here it is a threat. That 'nostra', 'our', gives poet and emperor a very ironic kind of equality: if Lucan does gain his poetic fame it will be because he has had the opportunity of narrating the eclipse of the political values he holds most dear.

13 Frederick M. Ahl, *Lucan: An Introduction* (Ithaca and London, 1976), pp. 276–7. We may contrast the 'militiae pietas' of Caesar's devotees, which is specifically directed to the service of an individual usurping the common cause: 'virtus' is a great crime in a civil war (iv.499, vi.147–8, Ahl, *Lucan*, pp. 118–19).

The *Pharsalia*, then, is a dark poem, offering the stark alternatives of dehumanizing civil war or tyrannical peace. It is an anti-epic, vandalizing the conventions of Augustan imperial art. And yet its overall effect is much more than negative. As has been seen, the experience of reading the poem is a destabilizing one, as the poet constantly disrupts our expectations; and the poem displays a manic delight in its own iconoclastic creativity, its radical generic revisions. It is, after all, a young man's epic: Lucan was only twenty-six at his death. This perhaps helps to account for his relentless over-insistence; but the relentlessness does have a certain exuberance. For all the gloom expressed in the poem, Lucan himself, the early modern period believed, had not himself renounced hope of some form of political action: he committed suicide after the discovery of his involvement in an attempt to overthrow the emperor. Even if hopes of practical resistance were limited – as Lucan's failed conspiracy confirmed – the poet could damage the icons of imperial rule. His subject-matter, the civil wars from Caesar's crossing the Rubicon down to his arrival in Egypt, parallels Caesar's own account in his own *De Bello Civili*, but systematically undermines Caesar's claims to moral authority. In blackening the founder of the Augustan dynasty, the epic also of course systematically undermines Virgil.

Where Virgil and Horace liked to sing of concord, Lucan describes both the Roman state and the cosmos as a 'discors/Machina' (i.79–80), an unstable, discordant mechanism, epitomized in the 'concordia discors' (i.98) of the triumvirate. His own poem enacts that kind of discord, distrustful of verbal music and rhetorical symmetry which his own tortured, elliptical style implicitly indicts as specious and dishonest. He has found a way of emulating Virgil without bowing to his authority, and there is a kind of grim vitality in the midst of the poem's darkness.[14] Even if the imperial monuments appear to be lasting and the republican legacy is reduced to a scrawled message in charcoal, Lucan's constantly shifting, irreverent, unmonumental poem may be able to scribble an alternative in the very margins of the imperial culture on which it depends. Thus Lucan can say to the defeated party at Pharsalia:

> Greatest of men, whose fates through the earth extend,
> Whom all the gods haue leasure to attend;
> These acts of yours to all posterity
> Whether their owne great fame shall signifie,
> Or that these lines of mine haue profited
> Your mighty names; these wars, when they are read,
> Shall stir th'affections of the readers minde,
> Making his wishes, and vaine feares inclin'd

14 For a good characterization see Colin Burrow, *Epic Romance: Homer to Virgil* (Oxford, 1993), p. 183.

> As to a thing to come, not past, and guide
> The hearts of all to favour *Pompey's* side. (vii.207–13; May, sig. M1v)

A sense of irrecoverable loss, a shift from hope in political action to an internalization of virtue, moments of intensely partisan narratorial intrusion – these are characteristics of *Paradise Lost* as well as the *Pharsalia*. In Milton's case, they have been ascribed to his despair at the collapse of his cause after 1660. That, I shall try to show later, is only partially true. Behind such claims there seems to be an unexamined assumption: poetry that is politically radical will be positive and optimistic. That assumption will survive only a brief acquaintance with the poetry, say, of Shelley – a great admirer of Lucan. For those committed to political change, much of past history will be perceived as tragic; without such a perception, there would be little motivation for change. The almost mechanical repetition of injustice may at the same time give history an aspect of gruesome, black comedy – which can again be seen both in Lucan and in the characteristic wit of Milton and other republicans. As will emerge in a study of the reading of Lucan in the seventeenth century, such humour as the times seemed to offer was often decidedly black. English admirers of the Roman republic were never particularly sanguine about the political future.

Trojan horses: Lucan, May, and the emergence of republican literary culture, 1614–1629

'A pretty conceit of the Authors for those that shall read his booke'. Thus did Sir Arthur Gorges gloss Lucan's address to Pompey's side in his 1614 translation of the *Pharsalia*.[15] His marginal note presents the book as a space in which seventeenth-century readers can become involved in a universal struggle between absolutist and republican values. And that is how some readers responded. John Aubrey believed that May's 'translation of *Lucans* excellent Poeme made him in love wth y^{e} Republique – w^{ch} Tang [*Odorem*] stuck by him'.[16] The reception of the *Pharsalia* is a classic example of a phenomenon repeatedly denounced by Thomas Hobbes. There was 'never any thing so deerly bought,' he complained, 'as these Western parts have bought the learning of the Greek and Latine tongues . . . the *Universities* have been to this nation, as the wooden horse was to the Trojans'.[17] He argued that:

> as to Rebellion in particular against Monarchy; one of the most frequent causes of it, is the Reading of the books of Policy, and Histories of the antient Greeks, and

15 *Lucans Pharsalia*, trans. Gorges, p. 270.
16 Bodleian MS Aubrey 8, fol. 27r; *ABL*, II, 56.
17 Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, II.21; ed. C. B. Macpherson (Harmondsworth, 1968), p. 268; *Behemoth, or The Long Parliament*, ed. Ferdinand Tönnies (1889; reprint, ed. Stephen Holmes, Chicago and London, 1990), p. 40.

> Romans; from which, young men, and all others that are unprovided of the Antidote of solid Reason, receiving a strong, and delightfull impression, of the great exploits of warre, atchieved by the Conductors of their Armies, receive withall a pleasing Idea, of all they have done besides; and imagine their great prosperity, not to have proceeded from the æmulation of particular men, but from the vertue of their popular forme of government.[18]

Hobbes is ready to allow that one may derive exemplary moral lessons from classical texts: they provide patterns of individual heroism – as, for example, did Lucan's Cato for that strong monarchist Dante. Where the rebels go wrong is in moving from the moral to the political: they assume that the virtues they admire will mostly be found under particular kinds of political structure. This makes them prefer rhetorical partiality to disinterested impartiality. Lucan was a prime offender in this respect: '*Lucan* shews himself openly in the *Pompeyan* Faction, inveighing against *Caesar* throughout his Poem, like *Cicero* against *Cataline* [*sic*] or *Marc Antony*, and is therefore justly reckon'd by *Quintilian* as a Rhetorician rather than a Poet'.[19] Hobbes went so far as to declare that ''tis a very great fault in a Poet to speak evil of any man in their Writings Historical'; Tacitus and other writers were wrong to censure the Roman emperors who had no chance of answering their charges (II, 71).

Hobbes clearly responded to Lucan's iconoclastic imagination, but it was in terms of the deepest alarm. He acknowledged that 'fancy' was an important element in poetry, and that Lucan excelled in it; but his discussion of fancy was heavily informed by a sense of its political dangers. It is associated for Hobbes with 'Sublimity . . . that Poetical Fury which the Readers for the most part call for', and this leads them to 'give to it alone the name of Wit' and to disdain reason and judgement (II, 70). Lucan's fancy, Hobbes argues, calls attention to the poet at the expense of his subject-matter; it 'is fitter for a Rhetorician than a Poet, and rebelleth often against Discretion' (II, 72). Here again Hobbes's suspicion of rhetoric reveals its political charge. It is interesting that his example of this rebellious wit is the celebrated 'Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni' (i.128). Hobbes is appalled both by the line's political partiality and by its religious irreverence. Though himself hardly orthodox in his religious outlook, he found political implications in speaking 'disgracefully to the Depression of the Gods', in contrast with Homer who always made Jupiter impartial (II, 73). Though Hobbes was writing long after the Restoration, when the monarchist cause had triumphed, he was still anxious about the power of a poem like Lucan's to resist such triumphs, to unsettle the regime's ideological stability and unleash a heterodox imagination.

18 Hobbes, *Leviathan*, II, 29, Macpherson, p. 369.

19 Hobbes, preface to *Homer's Odysseys* (1675; H2556), in J. E. Spingarn (ed.), *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1908), II, 73.

An admiration for Lucan did not in itself imply republican sympathies. His more orthodox and humourless readers could persuade themselves that the invocation to Nero was the expression of a genuine monarchism. And it was found possible to do with Lucan what Hobbes felt to be almost impossible: to treat his characters in apolitical terms without relating their virtues to specific institutions. The tendency of humanist literary scholarship, however, was to set literary texts in sharply specific political contexts, and it became ever harder to ignore Lucan's hostility to monarchical rule. Whereas Virgil's imperial epic centres on one central figure, Aeneas, who functions as a type of Augustus, Lucan's republican epic is suspicious of locating political salvation in an individual. As in *Paradise Lost*, the most obvious hero is also the villain. Caesar is a single-minded and unified figure because he subordinates the interest of the state to his own private interest (iii.108, 168). There is undoubtedly an ambivalent fascination with Caesar's heroic energy, but the poem questions the nature of true heroism: its repeated gory invocations of bloodshed lead to doubts about whether the war was worth fighting. Pompey, his chief opponent, is almost an anti-hero, liable to disastrous lapses of judgement such as his proposal after the defeat at Pharsalia to ally with the Parthians (viii.262ff). Here again an ideological point is at issue. Pompey is less dramatic as a character precisely to the degree that he is more of a republican: the Parthian debate is presented partly to show Pompey allowing himself to be outvoted (viii.455). Lucan brings the tension between individual heroism and collective decisions to its height by demonstrating that each may be flawed, especially in these final days of the republic. In fact in agreeing to go to Egypt instead of enlisting the Parthians, Pompey goes to his death. Before the battle that gives the poem its traditional name, Pompey suggests that a less bloody way of proceeding could be found, but he is urged on by Cicero, the voice of republican integrity. In a double irony, Pompey proves himself as a hero in a republican mould by obeying the will of the Senate rather than following his personal impulses, but in doing so unleashes horrifying bloodshed and dooms himself. As has been seen, Lucan emphasizes after Pompey's death the distinction between a struggle for Pompey and a struggle for liberty.[20] His analysis, contrary to Hobbes's, is that the loss of a 'popular forme of government' doomed Rome, whatever might have been expected from 'the æmulation of particular men'.

Lucan's poem, then, encouraged its readers to relate individual characters to broader social and political processes. The first book of the *Pharsalia* was in fact much cited by two of the leading seventeenth-century theorists

20 Lucan thus combats a Roman mode of historical revisionism, inaugurated by Augustus himself, which cast the Empire's enemies as 'Pompeiani', motivated by personal rather than ideological factors: Ahl, *Lucan*, p. 56.

of republicanism, James Harrington and Algernon Sidney.[21] In Harrington's case, his allusions to Lucan can be linked with his explicit rejection of Hobbes's anti-republican mode of reading: for Harrington, it was indeed institutions rather than men that created virtue. As will be seen in more detail in chapter 8, Harrington could find support in Lucan's anti-Augustanism for a republican theory of history. Virgil's eclogues allegorized the agrarian problems of the late Roman republic which the Empire, unable to solve, only made worse. Once the aristocracy began to consolidate their power by military means, they became more and more dependent on armed defenders. Under the Empire this became a hereditary caste and increasingly unreliable; the emperors instead sought aid from the Goths, who eventually took over power themselves.[22] Though Lucan had not given an extensive analysis of Roman social and economic structures, his poem, as summarised by May, certainly showed that Rome 'could neither retaine her freedom without great troubles, nor fall into a *Monarchy* but most heavy and distastfull' (sig. A4v). For Harrington, the central error was the degree of structural inequality in the state. Rome had taken a wrong turning at an early stage; and its effects had gradually become more and more destructive. Harrington dated the period narrated by Lucan, Caesar's rise to supreme power, as a crucial turning-point in world history. The first period ended

> with the liberty of *Rome*, which was the course or *Empire*, as I may call it, of *antient prudence*, first discovered unto mankind by God himself, in the fabrick of the *Common-wealth* of *Israel*, and afterward picked out of his footsteps in nature, and unanimously followed by the *Greeks* and *Romans*. The other beginning with the Arms of *Caesar*; which extinguishing liberty were the Transition of *ancient* into *modern prudence*, introduced by those inundations of *Huns*, *Goths*, *Vandalls*, *Lombards*, *Saxons*, which breaking the *Roman Empire*, deformed the whole face of the world, with those ill features of Government, which at this time are become far worse in these Western parts. . .[23]

The long-term effects of the Roman civil wars, then, had been incalculably great, leaving their mark on every level, from landholdings to language. The pattern of the subordination of public to private had been perpetuated by the monarchies that succeeded after the barbarian invasions. Citizens became subjects, forced to revere their king as a father rather than debating with him

21 Algernon Sidney, *Discourses Concerning Government*, ed. Thomas G. West (Indianapolis, 1990), *passim*. Not all the citations given as such in the index are in fact from Lucan; but the powerful denunciation of absolutist peace (II, 26, p. 260) seems to echo *Pharsalia*, i.24ff.

22 'A Note upon the Foregoing Eclogues', *HPW*, pp. 579–81.

23 *James Harrington's 'Oceana'*, ed. S. B. Liljegren (Lund and Heidelberg, 1924), p. 12; *HPW*, p. 161.

as an equal. The shift from ancient to modern prudence 'overwhelmed *ancient Languages, Learning, Prudence, Manners, Cities, changing* the Names of Rivers, Countries, Seas, Mountains and Men; *Camillus, Caesar and Pompey*, being come to *Edmund, Richard, and Geoffrey*'.[24] Humanists were ruefully aware that their mother tongues were products of the 'barbarism' they deplored. With a strong sense of building up to a climax, Milton wrote that the fall of the Empire led to the decay of 'Learning, Valour, Eloquence, History, Civility, and eev'n Language it self' (*History of Britain*, *MPW*, v.1.127). In their early phases those languages might at least have had a pristine simplicity; but they had steadily absorbed the vainglorious titles of the imperial and ecclesiastical hierarchies, in a process parallel to the Roman decline charted by Lucan. He records Caesar's manipulation of traditional political offices until they become empty names:

> For all those words then their beginning had,
> With which ere since our Emperours we claw.(v.385; May, sig. H6v)

May glosses: 'Then beganne all those names of flattery, which they afterward vsed to their Emperours, as *Diuus*, Ever *Augustus*, Father of his countrey, Founder of peace, Lord, and the like' (sig. I6r). This restriction of the good of the whole to the private interest of an individual or a few families was for Harrington characteristic of modern prudence; it was an empire of men and not of laws, while ancient prudence placed the public above the private, laws above men.

For Harrington, modern prudence had disastrous effects on religion as well as on civil life: Tiberius murdered Roman liberty at the same time as Pilate murdered Christ. The values of early Christianity had been congenial to those of the Roman regional cities which still retained some degree of political autonomy. The Christians had borrowed the word *ecclesia* from civic assemblies to describe their own democratic meetings. As the Empire grew in power, however, its hierarchical structure both corrupted and was corrupted by the organization of the church, which became a monarchy under the Pope.[25] State and church vied with each other for monopolies of religious life; when the papacy took control of the church from the Emperors, public revenues were siphoned into an unaccountable religious bureaucracy, and the public preaching of the word was confined to a mystical elite. Harrington and other republicans and radical Puritans went beyond what had become the orthodox Protestant analysis of church-state relations. On that analysis,

24 Harrington, *Oceana*, ed. Liljgren, p. 42; *HPW*, p. 190.

25 Mark Goldie, 'The Civil Religion of James Harrington', in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 197–222.

the Emperors had been the proper guardians of the church; their authority had been usurped by the Papacy, but in the sixteenth century Protestant monarchs were able to reclaim their legitimate position as heads of the church. In Foxe's immensely influential *Acts and Monuments*, and in such literary allegorizations as Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, the monarch is aligned with the true church, in the struggle against the Pope who is identified with the Antichrist of the book of Revelation. Protestantism could thus become a powerful legitimation for monarchy, and it remained so for many on both sides of the English Civil War.

But even within the Foxean paradigm there were some problems for monarchists. If kings had for so many centuries allowed themselves to become willing dupes of the papacy, and if the quest for a vainglorious monopoly of power was the governing force behind papal rule, could monarchy ever really transcend the corruptions to which it was always liable? In the mid-seventeenth century there emerged new readings of Revelation which placed the thousand-year rule of Christ on Earth in the future, rather than identifying it with the uncorrupt phase of the Empire. Kings who opposed religious reform came to be identified themselves with the Antichrist, who opposed the advent of Christ as the one true king. The ecstatic millennial republicanism which came to a climax in the 1650s seems a long way indeed from Harrington's secular voice, but it was possible to forge an alliance between millennial and Harringtonian republicanism, between religious and civil liberty. Humanist practices of reading, when applied to biblical texts, would produce a highly politicized analysis. Religious radicals looked back to an early stage of Christianity before communication had been distorted by the monopoly interests of the church. Republicans could link that ideal with their nostalgia for the classical agora. English republicanism spanned a broad range of religious opinions, from extreme Puritanism to the scepticism of May and Chaloner, but anticlericalism was a common factor.

The emergence of secular and religious republicanisms can be traced in the reception of Lucan. Indeed a prominent example of the word 'républicain' in its modern sense comes in the preface to one of the most important early modern poems to be composed in Lucan's shadow, Agrippa d'Aubigné's *Les Tragiques* (published in 1616). The preface to this work records d'Aubigné's fears that its publication would gain him 'le nom de turbulent, de republicain'. It is clear from the context that the word here implies someone who 'affectoit plus le Gouvernement Aristocraticque que Monarchique'. D'Aubigné insists that unlike these republicans he opposes only tyranny, not monarchy itself. His answer to such doubts, however, is less reassuring to monarchists than it first appears: he declares that the French monarchy in its founding principles is the best government in the world, and that after it he

prefers the Polish system.[26] The Polish monarchy was elected by the aristocracy, and it was widely argued that this had also been the case with the early French monarchy.[27] For d'Aubigné, then, to be a 'républicain' is to desire a state without any kind of monarchy, while his own non-republican position involves a strictly limited, elective monarchy. It was certainly not inconsistent with taking up arms against the monarch. In the year *Les Tragiques* appeared he was involved in an aristocratic rebellion, and in an earlier poem he had contrasted himself explicitly with Lucan as one who was prepared to take up arms rather than suffering martyrdom.[28]

If we use the term 'republican' in the sense to which d'Aubigné here assigns it, we can say that there were very few republican readers of Lucan in pre-Civil-War England. But the poem did become identified with a particular kind of political grouping that, while not specifically anti-monarchical, had distinct hankerings after a severely limited monarchy which, as far as some absolutist theorists were concerned, would be in practice little better than a republic. Protestants nurtured on the Foxean tradition were ready to believe that throughout Europe the Habsburg monarchies, working in tandem with the militant Counter-Reformation, were engaged in a conspiracy to suppress political and religious liberty. It seemed that the terrible history Lucan told might repeat itself, unless the champions of liberty were better organized this time round. And there was a strong consciousness of the need for concerted international action. The favoured strategy of the absolutists, it was held, was to pick nations off one by one by undermining the king, courtiers and churchmen. Lucan's English readers were alert to this danger.

D'Aubigné's *Les Tragiques* demonstrated the ways in which Lucan could be linked with a Protestant world-view. It is saturated with allusions to Lucan: the poet had in fact composed a Latin poem on the French wars made out of extracts from the *Pharsalia*, directly linking the Roman civil wars with those of his own country. At the start of *Les Tragiques* d'Aubigné boldly outdoes Lucan by identifying his Muse with Caesar at the Rubicon. Since Rome is now the centre of political as well as religious corruption, a civil war that strikes at Roman power is to be celebrated. Like Lucan, d'Aubigné mingles poetry with history, lamenting the fate of the Huguenots at the hands of their adversaries. He later composed a prose account of his times in the polemical *Histoire Universelle*, which was condemned at Paris on its publication in 1620. Where

26 Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Les Tragiques*, ed. Jean-Raymond Fanlo, 2 vols. (Paris, 1995), I, 5, 16 (Fanlo, unlike previous editors, takes the late manuscripts as representing the author's final revisions). Jean Céard, '"République" et "Républican" en France au XVI[e] siècle', in Jacques Viard (ed.), *L'Esprit républicain* (Paris, 1972), pp. 97–105, concludes that in general the term was 'vide de tout contenu positif' (p. 105).

27 David Quint, *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton* (Princeton, 1993), pp. 200–1.

28 Quint, *Epic and Empire*, p. 192.

Lucan generalizes the struggle at Pharsalia into a universal struggle between Caesarism and liberty, d'Aubigné gives the opposition a Protestant apocalyptic colouring, linking the cause of liberty with that of the persecuted truth, the wandering woman in the wilderness of the Book of Revelation. His epic therefore addresses not just French history but the universal Protestant cause. Amongst his cast of martyrs are the Englishwomen Anne Askew, Lady Jane Grey, and Queen Elizabeth I.

This international concern marked the first English translators of the *Pharsalia*. Christopher Marlowe, whose version of the first book was posthumously published, had also written a play on the French civil wars, *The Massacre at Paris*, in which the Catholic leader Guise was patterned on Lucan's Caesar.[29] The first full English version, by Sir Arthur Gorges, appeared in 1614, at a time when there were growing fears that King James I was abandoning Elizabethan policies of hostility to Catholic Spain. Spanish influence lay behind the imprisonment of Gorges's friend Sir Walter Ralegh; and in 1614 Ralegh's *History of the World*, which appeared from the same publisher[30], was called in for irreverence towards monarchy. This act of censorship recalled Lucan's chronicle of the ways in which imperial authority stifled free speaking, and in a commendatory sonnet to Gorges's translation Ralegh presented Lucan and his translator as martyrs to the cause of truth. Throughout the poem, Gorges invokes the spirit of Elizabethan militancy. Lucan was unusual amongst ancient poets in describing naval as well as land warfare, and like Ralegh in his *History*, Gorges drew frequent parallels between ancient warfare and the exploits of the English.[31] He recalls English participation in the siege of Antwerp (p. 77, see note to ii.676–7): Elizabeth had supported the young Dutch state in its struggle against the Spanish monarchy, but James was much more wary about this alignment. The Antwerp allusion would have been pleasing to the Dutch statesman and republican theorist Hugo Grotius, who visited England in the year Gorges's translation appeared, and brought out his own edition of the *Pharsalia* in the same year. He was a great admirer of Lucan, and is said always to have travelled with a copy of the *Pharsalia* in his pocket. Lucan, he declared, was a freedom-loving, aristocratic, and tyrant-hating poet; let the Dutch read it so that the more they loved the Spanish bard (he had been born at Cordoba), the more implacably they would hate

29 William Blissett, 'Lucan's Caesar and the Elizabethan Villain', *Studies in Philology* 53 (1956), 553–75 (565). 30 I owe this point to Anna Beer.

31 On the reading of classical texts as storehouses of military wisdom, see Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, '"Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', *Past and Present* no. 129 (1990), 30–78 (69ff); and on Lucan's reputation as a military poet see Walter Fischli, *Studien zum Fortleben der Pharsalia des M. Annaeus Lucanus* (Luzern, n. d.), pp. 47, 49.

the Spanish king.[32] Grotius exercised a great influence on English political thought, and his championship of Lucan strengthened the poem's republican colouring. We do not have to read Gorges's translation as a specifically republican gesture[33]; but it did serve as a kind of rallying cry for a common cause in a general European struggle to safeguard religious and civil liberties.

Gorges's Lucan would have found an attentive audience in the MPs who assembled in 1614 for a particularly contentious Parliament. When one MP was imprisoned for a seditious speech, the diplomat Sir Henry Wotton dismissed him as 'a young gentleman fresh from the school, who having gathered together divers Latin sentences against kings, bound them up in a long speech, and interlarded them with certain Ciceronian exclamations'. Hobbes's Trojan horse was having its effect. Wotton observed that such comments were more appropriate in 'a Senate of Venice, where the treaters are perpetual princes, than where those that speak so irreverently are so soon to return (which they should remember) to the natural capacity of subjects'.[34] Like the imagined readers of Gorges's Lucan, the MP had transported himself out of monarchical language.

The next English Lucan appeared at a time of heightened political polarization. In 1619 King James's son-in-law, Frederick V of the Palatinate, was elected King of Bohemia. The election, which shifted the European balance of power in a Protestant direction, was repudiated by the Habsburg powers. A contemporary pamphlet used extracts from the *Pharsalia* to illustrate the transformation of fortunes by which Frederick began as a militant Caesar and ended as a defeated Pompey, driven with his wife Elizabeth into life-long exile.[35] The Habsburg regime stripped the Bohemian nobility of their traditional liberties and suppressed the region's strong Protestant traditions. For Bohemia, with its traditions of limited monarchy, these events had long-term consequences as great as Pompey's defeat for Rome. Frederick's son and heir Charles Louis was so fond of the poem that he ordered his tutor to translate it.[36] There was strong pressure for James and then Charles to

32 Letter to Daniel Heinsius, 20 April 1614, in *Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius*, I, ed. P. C. Molhuysen (The Hague, 1928), 307. For Grotius's influence on English republicanism, see Tuck, *passim*.

33 Burrow, *Epic Romance*, pp. 188–9, writes that in a passage where Gorges greatly expands on Lucan (pp. 332–7, cf. viii.480), he outlines an orthodox theory of good council; but the warning that '*Rome* doth Monarchie disdaine' and may therefore expel kings, glossed 'Rome euer an enemy to Monarchy' (p. 335), goes well beyond what would have been prudent at the court of James I.

34 *Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, ed. Logan Pearsall Smith, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1907), II, 37–9.

35 *Violenti imperii imago* (n. pl., 1621), pp. 12–16. The volume begins with quotations from Seneca.

36 Fischli, *Studien zum Fortleben der Pharsalia*, p. 57.