

In the matter of spondaic verses, nine out of twelve occur in the elegies (65–68), constituting what Ross thinks is a striking feature. He goes to great trouble to state that two of the three examples in the epigrams (including 76) are due to neoteric contamination; then of 76. 13 (p. 131) he says, “it seems to me, [the spondaic line] cannot be understood in this way at all, but must rather have been allowed solely for its sonorous and unrelenting effect.” I would have said that the neoterics valued it for just that reason, thus removing 76 from the epigram to the elegy category.

The third and only other sign that 76 is an epigram is the use of *que-que* which is presented (p. 67) as a “... clear case of *que-que* as a neoteric mannerism,” thus classifying its use in the elegies and its absence from the epigrams. But on p. 65, Ross writes: “The only instance of *que-que* is 76. 8, where it can be called neither neoteric nor Ennian (it does not, like the others, come at the end of the line); it would appear here to be simply a metrical convenience.” We have here what I call the *ad hoc* negation. Its main use seems to be to preserve the thesis from disastrous attack by a fact or datum which will not conform to it; but once the use of such negation is sanctioned, then every fact or datum lies open to its effect, with the result that the entire thesis

must be regarded as suspect. Obviously then *que-que* is a clear sign by Ross’s own classification that 76 is an elegy, not an epigram. As to its final position, yes, in the polymetrics and the epics; but in 66. 40, the only undisputed elegiac example, it is in nearly the same position as at 76. 8, which is not final. If position is a valid criterion, then this is another clear sign that 76 is an elegy.

These are all the proofs that Ross can muster that 76 is an epigram and not an elegy. Violation of Hermann’s Bridge is ambiguous; use of spondaic lines leans heavily toward elegy despite the uneasy attempt to prevent it; the use of *que-que* is by Ross’s own classification a proof of neoterism and therefore of the poem’s being an elegy, despite Ross’s efforts to stave off that disaster. We must conclude then that 76 is by style demonstrably an elegy. Thus, however one may wish to segment the Catullan corpus, after the epics we do have a group of elegies, then a group of epigrams, then another elegy, then the rest of the epigrams. I do not present any reason why 76 is thus sequestered, but its sequestration seems to be an important clue to the way the Veronensis or its archetype was put together.

J. DAVID BISHOP

WHEATON COLLEGE
NORTON, MASSACHUSETTS

CICERO ATT. 2. 1. 5

In the year 60 B.C. Cicero and P. Pulcher were in the escort of a candidate for office. In their jesting interchange (“cum ipso etiam cavillor ac iocor”) Cicero made an indecent joke (implying incest between Clodius and his sister). In relating this incident to Atticus he added: “non consulare inquires dictum: fateor, sed ego illam odi male consularem.”

This is the first extant use of *consularis* (f.) for the wife of a consular senator. Doubtless Cicero did not confine that unusual usage to his private correspondence. The only early parallel is in a letter from M. Antonius to young Caesar (Suet. *Aug.* 69. 1). In defending

his relation to Cleopatra he referred to Caesar’s marriage to Livia: *feminam consularem*. Antonius could have remembered the interchange of 61–60 when Curio *filius* (*filiola*: Att. 1. 14. 5) was active in the defence of Clodius, and when Curio and Antonius were joined “in matrimonio stabili et certo” (*Phil.* 2. 44).

This usage does not reappear in extant documents before the second century after Christ, and by that time it has gained a quasi-official status.¹ In the opinion of Ulpian (*praefectus praetorio*, 222–28) it is properly applied only to wives of *consulares* (*Dig.* 1.

1. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, III, 469 f., n. 3. He notes the more frequent usage of *ὑπατική* in Greek inscriptions. Cf. *TLL*, IV, 572. 21.

9. 1): "consulares autem feminas dicimus consularium uxores."

I find three examples in the inscriptions. The earliest is from Sicily (*Thermae Himeraeae*) and records the assumption of the *toga virilis* by Titianus, who is recorded as "C. Maesi / Titiani et Fonteiae / Frontinae consu/larium filio." The date is probably shortly after the middle of the second century.² Then there is the *titulus honorarius* set up by the *decuriones*

and *plebs* of Asculum to Maria Aurelia Violentilla, daughter of a *vir consularis*, and *consularis femina* as wife of the consul Q. Egnatius Proculus. It was probably raised under the Severan dynasty.³ Finally, not far from this date a *procurator* set up an inscription to Fabatia Polla Fabia Domitia Gelliola, *patrona* and *consularis femina*.⁴

WILLIAM C. McDERMOTT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

2. *CIL* X. 7346; *ILS*, 1083. In *Eph. Epigr.*, IV (1881), 153 f., Mommsen drew up a *stemma* for this family, and placed the birth of the young man's son about A.D. 180. Cf. Fluss in *RE*, XIV. 1 (1928), s.v. "Maesius 9."

3. *CIL* IX. 6414b; *ILS*, 1166. Mommsen (*CIL*) suggested that the father of Maria was the famous Marius Maximus,

suffectus after 197 and *ordinarius* in 223 (cf. *ILS*, 2935-36). Egnatius was *suffectus* in an unknown year: cf. G. Barbieri, *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino* (Rome, 1952), No. 235.

4. In Taksebt (*Mauretania Caesariensis*): *CIL* VIII. 8993; *ILS*, 1200.