while he is aware of what is being said about Silanus, "non ex rumore statuendum." A little later in his oration, the emperor is even more explicit—"neque expedire ut *ambitione aliena* trahatur [princeps]." In other words, the emperor was aware that, in a keenly fought contest for these prized proconsulates, every effort would be made to force men to stand down, and that, if the emperor became the arbiter, he would be drawn into a tangled web of charge, countercharge, and rumor.

Significantly, such maneuvering had occurred in the previous year,[36] when Sex. Pompeius had attempted to force Manius Lepidus[37] to withdraw from the *sors Asiae*. It is not difficult to imagine the kind of campaign that had probably been waged to force C. Silanus to withdraw—presumably by people who were less concerned with his morals than with their own improved chance were a strong senior candidate no longer in the field. Dolabella, having the same seniority as Silanus, had an ax to grind; and it is worth noticing that, before Dolabella became proconsul of Africa in A.D. 23–24, Asia had gone to men who were his juniors—Manius Lepidus (proconsul in A.D. 21–22, consul in A.D. 11), and Fonteius Capito (proconsul probably in A.D. 23–24, consul in A.D. 12).[38] In the *sors* of A.D. 20, as well as in that of A.D. 21, the attempt to discredit failed; C. Silanus secured his proconsulship. But in governing badly, he opened the way again to those who were for one reason or another opposed to his appointment and who now saw their opportunity for vengeance. In such a way, as Tacitus says at the beginning of his account of the case, had the senators progressed from self-abasement to persecution —persecution that achieved its object in the ruin of C. Junius Silanus.

Thus the trial of Silanus falls into place. He received the punishment his actions in Asia clearly merited, but the historian found nothing dignified in the way that his senatorial colleagues took this opportunity to vent their jealousy and spite. It is clear too that Tacitus does not encourage us to search his account for the handiwork of a sinister and destructive tyrant. Given his views on provincial maladministration and on the degree to which the *princeps* should interfere with the senate's running of its own provinces, Tiberius' part in the affair, even if not at all times entirely statesmanlike, was predictable and honest and is portrayed as such by Tacitus. For their own reasons, the senate and, as it transpired, the people of Asia were more than satisfied with the emperor's actions. For Tacitus, it was not Silanus' fate that was disturbing, nor the emperor's conduct; it was the ambitious malevolence of certain senators, a characteristic that in the later years of the reign was to assume disastrous proportions.

D. C. A. SHOTTER

UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER

36. *Ann.* 3. 32. 2: "agitandi adversus Manium Lepidum odii nanctus."

37. For the identification of Manius Lepidus here, see R. Syme, "Marcus Lepidus Capax Imperii," *JRS*, XLV (1955), 22 ff.

38. See V. Chapot, *La province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie* (Paris, 1904), pp. 305 ff.; and D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, (Princeton, 1950), II, 1581.

QUALE PORTENTUM: HORACE *ODES* 1. 22. 13

In one of the most familiar of his Odes, Horace describes the wolf which allegedly fled from him in the Sabine wood as a *portentum*. On the use of the word here, the most recent commentators remark only: "τέρας, πέλωρον, something that goes against the normal laws of nature; the word here has a mock-heroic tone."[1] No annotator appears to have linked Horace's term to the fact that wolves figure in the prodigy lists of Livy and Julius Obsequens with a fair degree of frequency. That is to say, Horace may well be using *portentum* (=*prodigium*) in a semitechnical sense, in which case the tone would be mock-sacral as well as mock-heroic.

Unlike an ox or calf, a wolf need not speak

1. R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 1* (Oxford, 1970), p. 269. Kiessling-Heinze are silent.

or be born with two heads to qualify as a prodigy. Rather, the unnaturalness consists in the wolf's being sighted out of the wild, in a place inhabited by men.[2] This typically involves its penetrating the perimeter of the city, a town, or a camp. While other incidental particulars (e.g., attacks on humans) may be included, the element common to twelve of eighteen wolf prodigies in Livy and Obsequens is this feature, emphasized by the almost formulaic *ingredi*[3] or *intrare*.[4] (*Penetrare* and the weaker *videri in urbe* or *in Capitolio* also occur.[5]) Often, the wolf's subsequent flight is mentioned.[6]

Horace's encounter, however, has by his own report taken place in the woods and only after he himself has carelessly wandered *ultra terminum* (10–11).[7] The use of the quasi-sacerdotal term by our *vates* is thus somewhat malapropos, but quite in keeping with the playful self-irony that characterizes the whole of this charming piece.[8]

THOMAS A. SUITS
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

2. For the general idea, cf. Lucan 1. 559–60: "silvisque feras sub nocte relictis / audaces media posuisse cubilia Roma."

3. Liv. 27. 37. 3, 32. 29. 2, 33. 26. 9; Obseq. 49 (109), 52 (112).

4. Liv. 21. 46. 2, 41. 9. 6; Obseq. 43 (103).

5. Liv. 32. 29. 2 (*penetrare*); Liv. 3. 29. 9 and Obseq. 63 (123) (*videri*, etc.); cf. also Obseq. 27a (86).

6. Liv. 3. 29. 9, 21. 46. 2, 33. 26. 9, 41. 9. 6; Obseq. 27a (86). The verbs are *effugere*, *evadere*, and *fugari*; cf. *fugit* in line 12 of this Ode.

7. An interesting item in Obseq. 33 (93) concerns the scattering, by a pack of wolves, of the boundary markers (*limites*) set by Gaius Gracchus (cf. Plut. *C. Gracch.* 11. 1). To be sure, this "prodigy" is an isolated case and not typical, but, as my colleague, Professor Allen M. Ward, reminds me, the story seems to have been widely circulated for political purposes; cf. *CAH*, IX, 81.

8. That it is precisely in the central part of this Ode that an ancient reader would have anticipated a note of parody is shown by E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. 186.

A NOTE ON CICERO *FAM.* 9. 26

Perhaps because it is not perused frequently (being included in only one annotated edition in my personal library), the letter addressed to Paetus, a person keen on dinner parties, still contains a difficult passage, further complicated, in the judgment of editors, by manuscript problems. The moot paragraph (9. 26. 3) reads:

An tu id melius, qui etiam [in] philosophum inriseris, ⟨qui⟩ cum ille, 'si quis quid quaereret,' dixisset, cenam te quaerere a mane dixeris? Ille baro te putabat quaesiturum, unum caelum esset an innumerabilia. Quid ad te? At hercule †cena non quid ad te tibi praesertim.[1]

The ingenuity of the editor solves some problems by assuming that "*agebas* is probably to be understood with *An tu id melius*," by bracketing *in*, and by supplying an additional *qui* (construed with a causal subjunctive), thus allowing a logical rendition of the first sentence:

Did your behavior indicate any higher sense of values, when (=seeing that) you mocked even a philosopher when he asked if anyone had a problem, (and) you said that dinner had been your problem since morning?[2]

The editor indicates that he would translate the next two brief sentences as follows: "The old fool was thinking that you would ask whether there was one universe or an infinite number. What was that to you!" Then he confesses that neither he nor others have solved the subsequent statement:

At . . . praesertim. These words cannot be construed as they stand, and emendation is necessary. Tyrrell suggests *At hercule quis 'cena num quid ad te?' tibi praesertim* ('But who on earth would say, "What's dinner to you?—especially to (a gourmet like) you?'). However, this proposed solution has its difficulties. No satisfactory emendation of the passage has appeared so far.[3]

The purpose of the present brief note is to suggest that the text of this sentence could stand without emendation if *cena* be construed as an ablative of respect and if the phrase *quid ad te* be placed within quotes, referring to the question immediately preceding. In English the mooted sentence could read: "But,

1. *Select Letters of Cicero*, ed. A. J. Watson-Wemyss (London, 1960), p. 54.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

3. *Ibid.*