

The Argive chorus exit at the end of their ode (867) and, as often in Seneca, do not share in the action of the *exodos*. A choral *Schlusswort*, which became the rule in Euripides,<sup>24</sup> was required for Athenian tragedy to provide exit lines that would get fifteen men and the fluteplayer out of the orchestra and down the *parodos*. No Senecan tragedy (contrast *HOet.* and *Oct.*) ends with a choral utterance. That the chorus is not present in the *exodos* is indicated because (1) they provide no comment on Cassandra's description of the regicide (contrast Aesch. *Ag.* 1346–71); and (2) at 913–17 *Electra*, not the chorus, announces the entrance of Strophius. Indeed the kidnapping of Orestes is a criminal act which they ought not to witness.

This concludes my discussion of the movements of the chorus in Seneca's *Agamemnon*. These movements illustrate an extraordinary divergence from classical Greek practice. The Senecan chorus here and elsewhere exits and re-enters far more often than a classical Greek chorus. Hence the lack of oaths of complicity and the opportunity to plot on stage. Internal exits of a Greek chorus were rare and noteworthy (Aesch. *Eum.*; Soph. *Aj.*; Eur. *Alc.*). Aeschylus' *Aitnai*,<sup>25</sup> with five scene changes and so presumably five choral exits, was renowned and extreme.<sup>26</sup> Could Sicilian production have allowed a smaller chorus? The Senecan chorus was confined

to the relatively small playing area of the raised Vitruvian stage. Exits were measured in feet rather than yards. If, as I suggest, the chorus were small, whether the seven of the Cyrene painting or better three (*tres faciunt chorum*), discreet withdrawal and re-entry became simple matters. Seneca could stage the *Agamemnon* at a dinner party with a cast of ten slaves.<sup>27</sup> Six speak (three actors and three choreuts). There are two *personae mutae* (*famuli*) and two children (Orestes and Pylades). With what degree of illusion Strophius' chariot was handled we can only conjecture.<sup>28</sup>

What we may call Zwierlein's fallacy,<sup>29</sup> the argument that Seneca's dramas were recited and not performed because there would be no room for two choruses (thirty men?) on the Vitruvian stage, loses any cogency. Zwierlein failed to ask how large the chorus was, and, by thinking in terms of Athenian practice, he failed to establish exits.<sup>30</sup> Phaedra can declare her love to Hippolytus without an oath because the chorus has gone: "en locus ab omni liber arbitrio vacat" (*Phdr.* 601; cf. *HOet.* 484). Thus the advantages of a small, mobile chorus and private stage; and, as Seneca himself reports (*QNat.* 7. 32. 3), "privatum urbe tota sonat pulpitem."

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

24. See *CP*, LX (1965), 281.

25. "Wann werden die Leute lernen, dass der Titel so und nicht *Altraia* lautete?": Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften*, VI (Berlin, 1972), 246, n. 4; cf. *Aischylos Interpretationen* (Berlin, 1914), p. 242, n. 1; *Herakles*, I<sup>3</sup>, 56, n. 14.

26. See E. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, I (Rome, 1964), 249–62; and H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley, 1971), pp. 99–103.

27. Cost, therefore, would be minimal: see L. Hermann, *op. cit.* (n. 5), pp. 159–60.

28. For animals in the Greek theater, see P. D. Arnott,

*G and R*, N.S. VI (1959), 177–79. Euripidean horses are genuine; the donkey in *Ar. Vesp.* is "human": see further J. Vaio, *GRBS*, XII (1971), 342, n. 33.

29. See Zwierlein *op. cit.* (n. 11), pp. 80–81.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 81: "Aber kann sich in einem Bühnenspiel der Chor . . . einfach entfernen, ohne dass sein Weggehen motiviert wird, ja ohne dass wir den geringsten Hinweis erhalten? Dies ist ganz unglaublich . . ." The answer is "Yes, it can and does." As for *Hinweis*, we see the chorus leave and that is *Hinweis* enough that it is no longer there.

## TWO QUAESTORSHIPS

### I

C. Cassius Longinus, the tyrannicide, appears for the first time in the records of history in 53 B.C. as a gifted general immediately before and especially after the

catastrophe of Crassus' army at Carrhae. All the sources unanimously term him quaestor at that time.

According to Plutarch *Crassus* 18, the army commanded by Crassus was not pre-

pared to face the enemy and ὥστε καὶ τῶν ἐν τέλει τινας οἶσθαι δεῖν ἐπσχόντα τὸν Κράσσου αὐθις ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅλων γνώμην προθέσθαι· τούτων ἦν Κάσσιος ὁ ταμίης. In Cassius Dio 40. 25. 4, C. Cassius appeared immediately after the defeat at Carrhae when the remains of the Roman army were seized with panic: καὶ αὐτῶν οἱ μὲν ἄλόντες ἡμέρας γενομένης ἀπώλοντο, οἱ δὲ ἐς τὴν Συρίαν μετὰ Κασσίου Λογγίνου τοῦ ταμίου διεσώθησαν. Similarly Velleius Paterculus 2. 46. 4: "reliquias legionum C. Cassius, . . . tum quaestor, conservavit"; Auctor *De viris illustribus* 83: "Gaius Cassius Longinus quaestor Crassi in Syria fuit, post cuius caedem collectis reliquiis in Syriam rediit"; Eutropius 6. 18: "reliquiae exercitus per C. Cassium quaestorem servatae sunt." Festus *Breviarium* 17 also mentions Cassius (with the erroneous *praenomen* Lucius instead of Gaius) in connection with the battle of Carrhae: "Lucius Cassius, quaestor Crassi, . . . reliquias fusi collegit exercitus." Appian *BC* 4. 59, describing Cassius' military exploits in Syria in 43, records the reputation he had acquired among the Parthians ἐξ οὗ Κράσσῳ ταμιεύων ἐμφρονέστερος ἔδοξε τοῦ Κράσσου γενέσθαι. This must refer, it would seem, to 53, as only in that year did Cassius have the opportunity to show himself more skillful than his commander.

On the basis of this overwhelming evidence,<sup>1</sup> T. R. S. Broughton had no misgivings about assigning the quaestorship of C. Cas-

sius to 53.<sup>2</sup> D. R. Shackleton Bailey followed in the wake of Broughton,<sup>3</sup> but G. V. Sumner has recently voiced disagreement:<sup>4</sup> Sumner argues that C. Cassius was probably already Crassus' quaestor in 54 or even 55.<sup>5</sup> He points out that Cassius was older than Brutus (Plut. *Brut.* 29, 40; App. *BC* 4. 89), who was born in 85. Cassius' birthdate was probably 86, and so, according to the *leges annales*, he was already eligible for the quaestorship of 55. Ingenious, convincing (although not fully conclusive: possibility is not reality), and superfluous.

Of course, C. Cassius could not have been—and was not—quaestor in 53. The decisive evidence, however, escaped Broughton's attention, and Sumner also failed to notice it. The battle of Carrhae occurred on 9 June 53. If Cassius was a quaestor at that time, he had to have been elected to this office at the *comitia* of 54. However, a glance at the chronology of Roman elections will show that no regular magistrates were chosen in 54 for 53. When the delayed elections for 53 finally took place in Rome, sometime in July or August of that year,<sup>6</sup> the battle of Carrhae was over. Moreover, how could Cassius have stood in those elections, since, when they were held, he was still in Syria fighting the Parthians? In sum, when he saved the remnants of the Roman legions at Carrhae, Cassius was technically a proquaestor.<sup>7</sup>

1. Cf. Liv. *Per.* 108 (in the description of the events of 52 and 51): "C. Cassius, quaestor M. Crassi, Parthos, qui in Syriam transcenderant, cecidit." In 52 Cassius was a proquaestor; the expression *quaestor M. Crassi* refers to his past relationship with Crassus. The text allows, however, no inferences as to the date of his office. The same remarks apply to Justinus 42. 4: "exercitus Parthorum . . . in Syria a Cassio, quaestore Crassi, cum omnibus ducibus trucidatur."

2. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, II, 229. Cf. also *MRR*, *Suppl.*, p. 14. The same dating was accepted by Fröhlich, s.v. "Cassius (59)," *RE*, III (1897), 1727.

3. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, III (Cambridge, 1968), 221. Cf. also J. W. Eadie, *The Breviarium of Festus* (London, 1967), p. 133.

4. G. V. Sumner, "The Lex Annalis under Caesar," *Phoenix*, XXV (1971), 365.

5. In that way Sumner has revived the pre-Broughtonian tradition. W. Drumann-P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*, II (Leipzig, 1902), 99, accepted 54 as the year of Cassius' quaestorship, but they offered no proof. So also Th. Mommsen, *Geschichte des römischen Münzwesens* (Berlin, 1860),

p. 636, n. 498; P. Willems, *Le Sénat de la république romaine*, I (Louvain, 1878), 534; F. Sobeck, *Die Quästoren der römischen Republik* (Diss. Breslau, 1909), p. 59; G. Niccolini, *I fasti dei tribuni della plebe* (Milan, 1934), p. 334. L. Lange, *Römische Alterthümer*, III<sup>2</sup> (Berlin, 1876), 602 (Index; cf. pp. 367 and 387), opted for 55. This seems also to have been the opinion of I. C. Orelli and I. G. Baiter, *Onomasticon Tullianum*, II (Zurich, 1838), 134–35, and M. Büzl, *De provinciarum Romanarum quaestoribus* (Diss. Leipzig, 1893), p. 66.

6. On the date of the elections in 53, see Cass. Dio 40. 45. 1; App. *BC* 2. 71.

7. It is impossible to decide whether he held his quaestorship in 55 or in 54. If he left for Syria together with Crassus he must have been quaestor in 55. Crassus departed from Rome before the middle of November (see Drumann-Groebe, IV, 107; *MRR*, II, 215) and by that time the elections for 54 had not yet been held (Cic. *Att.* 4. 13). According to an attractive hypothesis of Sumner (*op. cit.* [n. 4], p. 249, n. 12), these elections did not take place until early in 54. If Cassius was elected for 54, he joined Crassus in Syria with some delay.

It is well to remember (as Sumner reminds us) that the term "quaestor" was frequently used by the sources in place of "proquaestor."<sup>8</sup> But it is seldom possible to prove that the terminology we find in our sources is so totally misleading as in the case of C. Cassius' quaestorship.

## II

The quaestorship of Q. Cassius Longinus is attested by Cicero, the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, and Cassius Dio. He was quaestor of Pompey by special choice; selected *sine sorte*<sup>9</sup> (a token of a close relationship between him and the triumvir), he served in Further Spain.<sup>10</sup> However, as tribune of the plebs in 50/49 he deserted Pompey and eagerly embraced Caesar's cause. His quaestorship in Spain was not so eventful as that of his cousin<sup>11</sup> in Syria: Gaius earned fame (and envy) by repulsing the Parthians; Quintus became notorious for his extortions. Quintus' course carried its risk, too: *ex insidiis vulneratus*, he barely escaped with his life.<sup>12</sup>

None of the sources mentioned above provides the exact date of his office: hence a considerable amount of disagreement in the modern scholarship. The following dates have been proposed, mostly without discussion: 56,<sup>13</sup> 55,<sup>14</sup> 54,<sup>15</sup> 52,<sup>16</sup> 51,<sup>17</sup> and 50.<sup>18</sup>

Some of these dates can be discarded without much argument. Cassius could not have held his quaestorship in 50, since in that year he stood for the tribunate of 49. Nor could

he have held this office in 56, for he is attested as Pompey's quaestor in Spain, and the law of Trebonius that gave Pompey command of both Spanish provinces for five years was not carried through until 55.

As Pompey sent his legates to Spain immediately after he received the command,<sup>19</sup> it is conceivable that Cassius was already elected for 55, and either went to Spain immediately after the passage of the *lex Trebonia* or remained in Rome as Pompey's *quaestor consularis* and assumed his provincial appointment in 54 as *proquaestor*. But he may just as well have been elected for 54 or 53.<sup>20</sup>

Nipperdey opted for 51; the verdict of Broughton was 52. Why these dates? Nipperdey based his theory upon Cicero's statements concerning the appointment of Q. Cassius *sine sorte*: "Pompeius . . . Q. Cassium sine sorte delegit, Caesar Antonium" (*Att.* 6. 6. 4); "potentissimorum duorum[sc. exemplum], qui omnes Cassios Antoniosque complexi sunt" (*Fam.* 2. 15. 4). He concluded that Cassius held his quaestorship simultaneously with Antonius. As he assigned the office of Antonius to 51, he also found automatically the date of Cassius' quaestorship. We may surmise that a similar line of thought was followed by Broughton: when he accepted 52 as the year of Antonius' quaestorship, he consequently dated the office of Cassius to the same year.

Leaving aside the question of the date of Antonius' quaestorship,<sup>21</sup> the inference made

8. Only Cicero in the heading of a letter (*Fam.* 15. 14) sent to Cassius in 51 from Cilicia calls him *proquaestor* (and himself *imperator*).

9. Cic. *Att.* 6. 6. 4, *Fam.* 2. 15. 4 (written in August 50). Drumann-Groebe, II, 130, interpret this as an example of Pompey's *Willkür*; so also V. Ehrenberg, s.v. "Losung," *RE*, XIII (1926), 1504. It is true that the quaestorian provinces were normally assigned by lot, but the governors could select their quaestors *sine sorte* on the basis of a special authorization by the senate. See Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, II<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1887), 532-34; Willems, *Le Sénat*, II, 607-608; and especially L. A. Thompson, "The Appointment of Quaestors *extra sortem*," *PACA*, V (1962), 17-25.

10. *Bell. Alex.* 48. 1, 50. 1; Cass. Dio 41. 24. 2.

11. *Frater* in Cic. *Att.* 5. 21. 2 clearly means *frater patruelis*, cf. Drumann-Groebe, II, 129-30.

12. *Bell. Alex.* 48. 1, 50. 1.

13. Drumann-Groebe, II, 130. According to Drumann-Groebe, Cassius remained in Spain until 50.

14. Mommsen, *Münzwesen*, p. 635, n. 495; Büzl, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 10; Sobeck, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 57; Niccolini, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 334. Büzl and Sobeck also think that he returned to Rome only in 50.

15. Münzer, s.v. "Cassius (70)," *RE*, III (1897), 1740 (*von 54 an*); Willems, *Le Sénat*, I, 535.

16. Broughton, *MRR*, II, 236 (but cf. Index of Careers, p. 544: ca. 52).

17. K. Nipperdey, "Die *leges annales* der römischen Republik," *ASG*, V.1 (1865), 32.

18. Orelli-Baiter, *Onomasticon Tullianum*, II, 137.

19. *MRR*, II, 220.

20. Thompson, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 19, opines that he was quaestor in 54 or 52; why not in 53?

21. He was quaestor in 51 (as suggested by Nipperdey), not in 52 (as in *MRR*). See A. Kaminska-Linderski and J. Linderski, "The Quaestorship of M. Antonius" (forthcoming).

by Nipperdey (and Broughton) does not seem to have any real basis in Cicero's testimony. What Cicero says is that both Cassius and Antonius were appointed in the same way *sine sorte*, but there is no hint in his text that it happened at the same time. If the order of names has any significance here, it may even mean that Cassius held his office before Antonius, but it would not be wise to press this point.

Two other letters of Cicero may offer some unexpected help. Cicero gives the following advice to C. Cassius (*Fam.* 15. 14. 4, written in October, 51): "ego ceterarum rerum causa tibi Romam properandum magno opere censeo . . . sed, si quae sunt onera tuorum, si tanta sunt, ut ea sustinere possis, propera . . . sin maiora, considera, ne in alienissimum tempus cadat adventus tuus." A few weeks later, in a letter to Atticus (5. 20. 8, written in Cilicia on 19 December, 51), Cicero entreated his friend: "Luceius de Q. Cassio cur tam vehemens fuerit et quid actum sit aveo scire."

22. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, III, 230-31. His prosecutor would have been L. Luceius

The incident mentioned in the letter to Atticus is otherwise not known, but Shackleton Bailey has ingeniously combined it with the enigmatic phrase "si quae sunt onera tuorum" in the letter to C. Cassius, and has acutely (albeit tentatively) deduced from it that Q. Cassius may have been on trial at that time.<sup>22</sup> Cassius' extortions in Spain offer a further clue. He may have been prosecuted *de repetundis* (or at least threatened with the prosecution); in that case we may infer that in 51 he was in Rome.

The foregoing considerations may have clarified some disputed points, but above all they have shown that the evidence on the exact date of Q. Cassius' quaestorship is strictly nonexistent, and that modern conjectures are of doubtful value. Q. Cassius could have been quaestor in any year between 55 and 51, although the odds are against his holding this office in 51.

J. LINDERSKI

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Q. f., the historian and friend of Cicero. Cf. Münzer, *s.v.* "Luceius (6)," *RE*, XIII (1926), 1557.

### THE KNEE AND THE SHIN (SENECA *APOCOLOCYNTOSIS* 10. 3)

"Nam etiam si sormea graece nescit ego scio *ENTYCONTONYKNHAIHC*." So reads the Sangallensis at a point in Divus Augustus' speech where, despite numerous attempts at emendation and explanation, text and interpretation remain in doubt. (For *sormea* the Valentianensis and Londiniensis have *forma* and *phor mea* respectively; both garble the Greek in their own fashion.)<sup>1</sup> Buecheler succeeded in restoring the proverb *ἐγγιον γόνυ κνήμης* to the satisfaction of all subsequent editors, but the remainder of his remedy has not won general approval. His bracketing of *Graece* as a gloss (following Sonntag and the

Parisinus 8717, which omits the word), while superficially attractive, is not really necessary,<sup>2</sup> and the absence of any similar "gloss" at the many other passages where the copyists have not understood the Greek is disquieting. More serious, his emendation *soror mea* has been judged arbitrary<sup>3</sup> and has appeared to raise as many questions as it answers: "it is hard to see why his sister should be mentioned" (Rouse);<sup>4</sup> "le sel et le sens même de l'allusion nous échappent, dans ce cas, absolument" (Waltz, who thinks that behind the manuscripts' *sormea* / *formea* lies an irrecoverable proper name). Rostagni was able

1. The word *senescit*, which follows the Greek characters in many old editions, has no manuscript authority but is apparently a mere dittographic survival from Beatus Rhenanus' conjecture formed of *-ce* (in *Graece*) and *nescit*; cf. A. P. Ball, *The Satire of Seneca on the Apotheosis of Claudius* (New York, 1902), pp. 208-10.

2. Cf. the explanation of C. F. Russo, *L. Annaei Senecae Divi Claudii ἀποκολύντωσις*<sup>2</sup> (Florence, 1955), p. 100:

"*Graece nescit* non significa che la sorella non sapesse il greco (e chi ci credrebbe?), ma scherzosamente vuole dire: 'sembra non saperlo,' dato che si comporta come se ignorasse quel tale proverbio greco che dice etc."

3. R. Waltz, *Sénèque: L'Apocoloquintose du divin Claude* (Paris, 1934), p. viii.

4. W. H. D. Rouse in the Loeb edition (London, repr. 1966), p. 391, n. 3.