

this double inheritance.<sup>14</sup> Virgil sees him not only as the bearer of the heavens (*Aen.* 4. 247 ff., 481 f.; 6. 796 f.; 8. 135 f., 140 f.), but as teacher of Iopas who sings *de rerum natura*.<sup>15</sup> Mercury may have absorbed some of his traditional cunning from his grand-uncle Prometheus. The presence of his grandfather Atlas in the opening apostrophe of Horace's Ode points more specifically to Mercury's role

as educator of mankind's mind and body through words, music, and athletics. It is to such an accomplishment that Horace directly turns, having made one brief but important allusion to another "teacher" in the god's past.<sup>16</sup>

MICHAEL C. J. PUTNAM

BROWN UNIVERSITY

14. The first mention of Atlas in Latin is Liv. And. *Od.* Frag. 29 Mariotti: "apud nympham Atlantis filiam Calypsonem . . ." Mariotti refers to *Od.* 4. 557 (= 5. 14; 17. 143): *νύμφης ἐν μεγάροις Καλυψούς, ἥ μιν ἀνάγκη* . . . We might with equal plausibility expect the phrase *Atlantis filiam* to define Calypso near her first appearance, i.e., *Od.* 1. 52: *\*Ἀτλαντος θυγάτηρ*. See S. Mariotti, *Livio Andronico* (Milan,

1952), p. 47, n. 1, for the possibility of "contamination."

15. For a detailed discussion of its contents, see C. Segal, "The Song of Iopas in the Aeneid," *Hermes*, XCIX (1971), 336-49.

16. See also *Odes* 3. 11. 1 ff. for another example of Mercury's power as teacher.

### WHO WENT TO LUCA?

In April 56, one of the most important events of the decade took place at Luca in Cisalpine Gaul, the renewal and strengthening of the unofficial agreement among Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus known as the First Triumvirate. In addition to the principals, no less than two hundred senators are reported to have attended, the names of only two of whom are attested, Metellus Nepos and Ap. Claudius Pulcher.<sup>1</sup> Obviously it is out of the question to try to identify even half of the people involved. Despite the wealth of documentation for the late Republic, the names of a great number of senators are still unknown, and many of these *pedarii* must have hastened to tie their fortunes to those of the triumvirs.<sup>2</sup>

However, we are also told that some of the two hundred were proconsuls and praetors, enough to require one hundred twenty lictors, and here we are on much surer ground. The names of four praetors and fourteen pro-

magistrates for 56 are known,<sup>3</sup> and an examination of their careers before and after 56 reveals changes in some cases, so that it is possible to say that they were at least affected by the conference and therefore may have attended it. This is admittedly speculation, but it is based on fact.<sup>4</sup>

Let us take the promagistrates first. Of the ten men concerned (excluding Caesar and Pompey, Metellus Nepos and Claudius), some can be omitted instantly, e.g., L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (Caesar's father-in-law), P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, and A. Gabinius, all of whom remained in their provinces all year,<sup>5</sup> and Cato, for obvious reasons. This leaves six other possibilities: C. Caecilius Cornutus, L. Caecilius Rufus, C. Pomptinus, Sex. Quinctilius Varus, C. Septimius, and Q. Valerius Orca. Of these, there is one who surely must have been at Luca, and that is Pomptinus. Caesar's predecessor as

1. Plut. *Caes.* 21. 2; *Pomp.* 51. 3; App. *BC* 2. 17.

2. P. Willems, *Le Sénat de la république romaine*, I (Louvain, 1878), 427-555, lists all those who he considers were senators in 55. The total is 415.

3. *MRR*, II, 208-12. The governor of Crete and Cyrene is unknown.

4. M. Gelzer, *Caesar*<sup>6</sup> (trans. P. Needham [Cambridge, Mass., 1968]), p. 121, n. 5, considers the figures of two hundred senators and one hundred twenty lictors to be exaggerated, on the basis of Plut. *Crass.* 14. 6 which says the three principals negotiated privately. However, it is surely possible, indeed probable, that in addition to those involved in private discussions, other senators paid their compliments to the triumvirs. The conference has been recently discussed by

E. Gruen, "Pompey, the Roman Aristocracy, and the Conference of Luca," *Historia*, XVIII (1969), 71-108, who argues convincingly for rejecting the traditional view of a complete aristocratic surrender to the triumvirs after 56. However, he agrees (p. 93; cf. p. 97) that "adherents or clients of the dynasts" as well as "opportunistic and ambitious senators" undoubtedly went to Luca.

5. Piso's campaigns as proconsul of Macedonia in 57/56 are reported by the hostile witness Cicero (*Pis.* and *Prov. cons.*). That Lentulus remained in Cilicia is also confirmed by Cicero, whose letters to him date from January 56 to December 54 (*Fam.* 1. 1-9). Gabinius, after crushing a Jewish revolt, began preparing an expedition against the Parthians. For sources see *MRR*.

governor of Transalpine Gaul, he had since then been waiting outside the *pomerium*, hoping to celebrate a triumph for his victory over the Allobroges in 62/61, a triumph blocked by the triumvirs' man, Vatinius, in 59. In 54 he was finally successful, when the praetor Ser. Galba (a former legate) illegally arranged for the triumph to be granted, an action in which he was helped by the consul Ap. Claudius. Cicero also lent his support.<sup>6</sup> Pomptinus had been a legate of Crassus in the revolt of Spartacus in 71, and his supporters Claudius, Galba, and Cicero all had connections with the triumvirs: Cicero's surrender to the dynasts is well known; Claudius, as we have seen, was at Luca; and it is very likely that Galba was also—he was with Caesar in Gaul from 58 to 56.<sup>7</sup> Galba would probably have wanted to reward his old commander Pomptinus anyhow, even if he had received no other backing. Nevertheless the pattern seems unmistakably to indicate triumviral help, or at least approval.<sup>8</sup>

Of the remaining promagistrates we can be less certain. Orca's early career is little known, but he voted for Cicero's return in 57 and was on good enough terms with him to be the recipient of two *litterae commendaticiae* in Africa some time in 56. However, his next appearance in Roman politics was as one of Caesar's legates early in 49, when he was sent to occupy Sardinia.<sup>9</sup> It is surely unlikely that he would have been given such a task if his adherence to Caesar was a last-minute conversion, and it would have been easy enough for him to travel to Italy from Africa. Pompey

visited Sardinia and Africa after Luca to supervise the corn supply,<sup>10</sup> and, although Cicero says this was his original plan, it is possible Pompey made the decision only after meeting the two governors.<sup>11</sup>

On the other hand, Caecilius Rufus, who could even more easily have come from Sicily (which Pompey also apparently visited) is found opposing Clodius in 57, helping his half-brother P. Sulla to accuse the triumvirs' man Gabinius of *ambitus* in 54, and in 49 was with Domitius Ahenobarbus at Corfinium.<sup>12</sup> Seemingly he was a confirmed Optimate. Unfortunately, however, alliance with Pompey in 49 (or even opposition to Gabinius) does not necessarily mean opposition to the triumvirs in 56 (as witness Ap. Claudius), so it is safer to say nothing definite about Rufus.

Cornutus, Quinctilius Varus, and Septimius are even more obscure, for virtually nothing is known of them after their governorships.<sup>13</sup> They all, like Orca and Rufus, supported Cicero's recall in 57,<sup>14</sup> and Cornutus (Bithynia and Pontus) and Septimius (Asia) are unlikely to have traveled to Italy from such distant provinces. Moreover, Cicero in 61 called Cornutus *Pseudocato*.<sup>15</sup> Varus in Farther Spain was considerably more accessible, but without any information it would be foolhardy to make any guess about his activity.<sup>16</sup>

Of the six possible promagistrates of 56, therefore, the most promising candidates for attendance at Luca (apart from the two whom Plutarch attests, Metellus Nepos and Ap. Claudius) are Pomptinus and Valerius Orca. What of the praetors? Unfortunately, only

6. Dio 39. 65; Cic. *Att.* 4. 18. 4; *Q. fr.* 3. 4. 6.

7. Galba remained a Caesarian, for his defeat in the consular elections for 49 was blamed on his Caesarian sympathies (*BG* 8. 50. 4). Ironically he joined in murdering Caesar in 44 (Suet. *Galb.* 3. 2).

8. Pomptinus was an experienced soldier who deserved his triumph. Sallust referred to him and his praetorian colleague L. Valerius Flaccus in 63 as *homines militares* (Sall. *Cat.* 45. 2; cf. Cic. *Cat.* 3. 6, where his actions against the conspiracy are also praised). Opposition to the triumph in 54 by Cato, another praetor Servilius Isauricus, and a tribune Q. Mucius Scaevola was caused by the way in which the triumph was voted ("negant enim latum de imperio, et est latum hercule insulse," Cic. *Att.* 4. 18. 4). Subsequently Pomptinus went to Cilicia with Cicero, but nothing more is known of him.

9. For 57 and 56, Cic. *Red. sen.* 23 and *Att.* 13. 6a and b; for 49, Caes. *BC* 1. 30. 2–3 and 31; App. *BC* 2. 40; Dio 41. 18.

10. Plut. *Pomp.* 50. 1; Cic. *Fam.* 1. 9. 9.

11. It has been suggested (F. Münzer, s.v. "Valerius [280]," *RE*, 2<sup>e</sup> Reihe, VIII.1 [1955], 172–73) that Orca was the son of the Q. Valerius who was killed by Pompey in Sicily in 82 (Plut. *Pomp.* 10. 4). If so, this would explain his choice of Caesar in the war, but makes his presence at Luca with Pompey doubtful. Orca's father was certainly a Quintus, but nothing else is known for certain.

12. Cic. *Mil.* 38; *Q. fr.* 3. 3. 2; Caes. *BC* 1. 23. 2.

13. Septimius was in the senate in 51 when a replacement for Caesar in Gaul was discussed (Cic. *Fam.* 8. 8. 5).

14. Cic. *Red. sen.* 23.

15. Cic. *Att.* 1. 14. 6.

16. A Sex. Varus was quaestor with Domitius Ahenobarbus at Corfinium in 49, and later with Attius Varus in Africa. If this is Quinctilius Varus' son, then it may indicate the political affiliations of the proconsul of 56, but nothing is certain.

four are known: M. Aemilius Scaurus, Q. Ancharius, C. Claudius Pulcher, and Cn. Domitius Calvinus. Ancharius can be easily dismissed. His background is conservative, for he was probably the son of the ex-praetor killed by Marius in 87, and he was one of the three tribunes who supported Bibulus against Caesar in 59. Similarly, he supported Sestius against Vatinius early in 56.<sup>17</sup> However, nothing more is known of him beyond the fact that he replaced Piso as governor of Macedonia in 55/54.

C. Claudius Pulcher is a different matter, and it seems very likely that he would have joined his brother Appius at Luca. Broughton identifies him as the Claudius who was in charge of Caesar's soldiers in Italy early in 58, and in the same year one of his sons threatened to prosecute Q. Cicero.<sup>18</sup> In 57 Gaius collaborated with his other brother P. Clodius in trying to prevent Cicero's removal from the Capitol of the tablet commemorating his exile.<sup>19</sup> All this makes his attendance at Luca highly probable. However, if any arrangements were made, Claudius benefited little. In 54 he planned to stand for the consulship, but withdrew when his command in Asia was prorogued,<sup>20</sup> and on his return he was successfully accused of *repetundae* and went into exile.<sup>21</sup>

The political affiliations of the remaining praetors, Scaurus and Calvinus, in some ways present a mirror image. Scaurus' connections with Pompey are well known: he had been Pompey's brother-in-law, and then his quaestor in Syria and Palestine, and in 56 he was in the

peculiar situation of being married to Pompey's ex-wife Mucia. It is not therefore surprising to find him, in the first half of the year, helping to defend C. Cato,<sup>22</sup> who was being prosecuted for the delaying tactics he had employed as tribune in 56, tactics which were largely responsible for the eventual election of Crassus and Pompey as consuls in 55. In return, Pompey, when appealed to by Scaurus, testified (in writing) on his behalf at his *repetundae* trial in July.<sup>23</sup> In addition, he originally supported Scaurus in his campaign for the consulship of 53, though Cicero doubted his sincerity,<sup>24</sup> but by November Pompey had long since withdrawn his support.<sup>25</sup> Thereafter his opposition seems to have continued, for he refused to intervene on Scaurus' behalf in 52 when he was tried for *ambitus*, with the result that Scaurus was condemned and went into exile, after which nothing is heard of him.<sup>26</sup>

Scaurus then is a potential triumphal adherent whose activities after 56 indicate a loss of support, unlikely if he had come to any agreement at Luca. Calvinus is the opposite. With Q. Ancharius he had sided with Bibulus and Sestius, but in 54 he is found drawing away from the Optimates. By July of that year Rome was seething with the news of an electoral *coitio* between two consular candidates, Calvinus and Memmius, who, to ensure their election, had come to an arrangement with the consuls Ap. Claudius and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus.<sup>27</sup> Some similarity of interests between the two candidates can be assumed, and Memmius was openly backed by Caesar.<sup>28</sup> However, Caesar was justifiably annoyed when

17. On his father see Plut. *Mar.* 43. 3; App. *BC* 1. 73; Florus 2. 9. 16; for Ancharius himself, Cic. *Sest.* 113; cf. Cic. *Vat.* 16 and Dio 38. 6. 1.

18. *MRR*, II, 198; Cic. *Att.* 3. 17. 1. T. P. Wiseman, "Pulcher Claudius," *HSCP*, LXXIV (1970), 207, identifies the son as Appius, the elder, who subsequently helped in the prosecution of Milo for Clodius' murder (Ascon. 34 Clark). He was probably the Appius who brought back the two Pompeian legions from Caesar in 50 (Plut. *Pomp.* 57. 4). If so, then he too was a Caesarian. For his later career, see Wiseman.

19. Cic. *Att.* 3. 17. 1.

20. Cic. *Scaur.* 35 suggests that Appius prosecuted Scaurus, who was also a candidate, to help his brother's candidature. It is more likely, as E. Courtney, "The Prosecution of Scaurus in 54 B.C.," *Philologus*, CV (1961), 154, has argued, that Appius was trying to help Memmius and Calvinus, two other candidates, with whom he had made a deal.

21. Cic. *Fam.* 8. 8. 3 and 11. 22. 1. Shackleton Bailey, "The

Roman Nobility in the Second Civil War," *CQ*, X (1960), 258, n. 2, suggests that his recall by Antony was at Caesar's instigation.

22. Ascon. 18 Clark. Cato was acquitted (Cic. *Att.* 4. 16. 5).

23. Ascon. 28 Clark.

24. Cic. *Att.* 4. 15. 7: "Pompeius fremit, queritur, Scauro studet, sed, utrum fronte an mente, dubitatur."

25. Cic. *Q. fr.* 3. 8. 3.

26. App. *BC* 2. 24. In 52, Pompey was moving (and marrying) into the Optimist circle.

27. Cic. *Q. fr.* 2. 15b. 4 and *Att.* 4. 15. 7.

28. Suet. *Iul.* 73; Cic. *Att.* 4. 15. 7 and 4. 16. 6. Memmius' political *volte-face* is as notorious as that of Cicero. Before 56 he was a vocal opponent of both Caesar and Vatinius (Suet. *Iul.* 23. 1, 49. 2, and 73; Cic. *Vat.* 33), together with his associates Licinius Calvus and Catullus, who also eventually became reconciled (Suet. *Iul.* 73).

the scandal was officially revealed by Memmius (at Pompey's instigation), some time before October, and thereafter, although Memmius continued to expect Caesar's support, Cicero believed in November that *hic quidem friget*.<sup>29</sup> Memmius and Calvinus dissolved their partnership, but Calvinus continued to show loyalty to the triumvirs and in particular Pompey by openly voting for the acquittal of Gabinius in his *maiestas* trial in October.<sup>30</sup> His career after 49 indicates firm support of Caesar and then Octavian. In short, Calvinus was an Optimate early in 56, but a Caesarian in 54, and such a change could easily have come about because of Luca.<sup>31</sup>

29. Cit. *Att.* 4. 17. 2; *Q. fr.* 3. 2. 3 and 3. 8. 3.

30. Cic. *Q. fr.* 3. 4. 1.

31. In a recent article ("The Consular Elections for 53 B.C.," *Hommages à Marcel Renard* [Brussels, 1969], II, 315) E. Gruen has argued, contrary to other scholars, that Scaraus and Memmius were the triumvirs' original candidates, Calvinus and Valerius Messala the conservative candidates. Ambition alone, however, does not adequately explain why

What conclusions can then be reached? It is a recorded fact that a number of promagistrates and praetors visited Caesar at Luca in 56, but no other definite statement can be made. However, certain promagistrates and praetors for that year later revealed pro-Caesarian sympathies or had a sudden change in fortune, consistent with a realignment of forces. Judging by their subsequent behavior, C. Pomptinus, Valerius Orca, Cn. Domitius Calvinus, and C. Claudius Pulcher are men who might easily have made the journey to Luca.

LÉONIE HAYNE

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

Calvinus was prepared to throw in his lot with a man openly backed by Caesar, or why Memmius should have approached Calvinus (was a colleague essential to the deal with the consuls?). Both men were triumphal opponents before 56. Why should Memmius have suspected that Calvinus might also have changed? It is tempting to assume both men had met before at Luca.

### AGAIN—PLATO'S SEVENTH LETTER<sup>1</sup>

It may seem otiose to add to the literature on the much-debated Seventh Letter of Plato, but, on the other hand, a very strong reaction may be worthy of record, especially when the basis for it has a somewhat different emphasis from points already made. As this strong reaction is on the side of the debate less favored at the moment, it may also for that reason suitably be added to the discussion.

The occasion for the adoption of this position in the long controversy over the Seventh Letter was a re-reading of the Letter for the sake of the historical information contained in it. This reading turned a casual acceptance of the present majority position into firm support of the negative minority, support bolstered by careful reading of the *Laws*, the work on which Plato must have been engaged when he wrote the Seventh Letter, if he did write it. To this reader the *Laws*,

in its language and manner, does not show the crabbed involutions that abound in the Letter. The *Laws* reads like Plato, the Seventh Letter does not.

It is very possible that this is not a matter of what is called "style," though the whole question of style in a language not one's own, no matter how well one knows it, is a very difficult one. In a recent book on Platonic styles, Thesleff has included a thorough description of the many and varied approaches to the question of style in Plato's works and their remarkably differing results.<sup>2</sup> He himself offers another kind of analysis and study, based on combinations of different kinds of writing and the coloring produced by patterns of sentence structure, grammatical constructions, figures of speech, and individual words characteristic of all these. He makes smaller claims for his method than analysts

1. The work on this paper has been made possible by two grants from the Ford Humanities Foundation Fund of Randolph-Macon Woman's College and by the hospitality of the Department of Classics of the University of Cincinnati and of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. To all

of these I am deeply grateful. My thanks go also to Professors Fordyce Mitchel and Robert Lloyd for corrections and suggestions.

2. H. Thesleff, *Studies in the Styles of Plato* (Helsinki, 1967), pp. 1-25.