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: "Lucceius de Q. Cassio cur tam vehemens fuerit et quid actum sit aveo scire."

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.[22] 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

22. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, III, 230–31. His prosecutor would have been L. Lucceius Q. f., the historian and friend of Cicero. Cf. Münzer, *s.v.* "Lucceius (6)," *RE*, XIII (1926), 1557.

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

"Nam etiam si sormea graece nescit ego scio *ENTYCONTONYKNHΛIHC*." 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 *forme a* and *phor mea* respectively; both garble the Greek in their own fashion.)[1] Buecheler succeeded in restoring the proverb ἔγγιον 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,[2] 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[3] and has appeared to raise as many questions as it answers: "it is hard to see why his sister should be mentioned" (Rouse);[4] "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 ἀποκολοκύντωσις*[2] (Florence, 1955), p. 100: "*Graece nescit* non significa che la sorella non sapesse il greco (e chi ci crederebbe?), 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.

to suggest a plausible explanation for a reference to Octavia here: according to him, Seneca is satirically contrasting the egoism of Augustus with the constant self-sacrificing behavior of his sister.[5] However, even Russo, by whom the case for this interpretation is perhaps best put,[6] is troubled by the questionable restoration of *soror* and "la conseguente difficile e poco sensata allusione all'altruismo della sorella."[7] Accordingly, he proposes to read instead *sura mea*:[8] "Even if your calf hasn't heard it, your knee is nearer than your shin."[9]

All discussions of this crux have been bedeviled by the assumption that "the knee is closer than the shin" is the equivalent of "charity begins at home," "prima per me, e per gli altri se ce n'è."[10] Without question, the proverb often does have this meaning, as is shown by such passages as Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 9. 1168b8, Theoc. *Id.* 16. 18, and Cic. *Fam.* 16. 23. However, proverbs in different languages cannot always be equated on a one-to-one basis. The relevant section of Zenobius, while ostensibly supporting the above interpretation, is instructive: *γόνυ κνήμης ἔγγιον· ἐπὶ τῶν ἑαυτοὺς μᾶλλον τῶν ἑταίρων ἀγαπώντων. φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῷ κατὰ Χαιρώνειαν πολέμῳ ἰδόντα τινὰ ἀνεψιὸν καὶ ἀδελφὸν καταπονουμένους, ὑπερασπίσαι τὸν ἀδελφὸν, εἰπόντα τὸ προκείμενον* (3. 2). Here the illustrative anecdote suggests that the proverb, beyond justifying mere egoism, may be used specifically to stress concern for kinfolk before strangers, or for the nearer of two kin.[11] In other words, there is present an accessory notion something like our "blood is thicker than water." That this is a reasonable meaning of the proverb in Augustus' speech may be seen from the complete context:

> Non vacat deflere publicas clades intuenti domestica mala. itaque illa omittam, haec referam; nam etiam si †sormea† Graece nescit, ego scio: *ἔγγιον γόνυ κνήμης*. iste quem videtis, per tot annos sub meo nomine latens, hanc mihi gratiam rettulit, ut duas Iulias proneptes meas occideret, alteram ferro, alteram fame; unum abnepotem L. Silanum . . . [10. 3–4].

Augustus has scant time to bewail the general losses, struck as he is by ones closer to home, which he proceeds to enumerate. In such surroundings, a proverb emphasizing duty to family first has at least as much point as one which does no more than rationalize self-centeredness.

How in this sense, then, would Octavia fail to recognize that the knee is closer than the shin? Antony is the shin, Octavian the knee. Augustus alludes wryly to the period during the thirties when Octavia attempted the awkward task of doing her duty as she saw it to both her brother and her husband. Seneca represents Augustus as rather peevishly resentful of such behavior on the part of Octavia as her refusing to leave her husband's house when ordered to do so by her brother, and her remaining steadfastly dutiful in her role of wife, even looking after Antony's political interests, until the time when her

5. A. Rostagni, *Seneca: Apokolokyntosis del divo Claudio* (Turin, 1944), p. 68. For another, highly speculative attempt toward explanation, cf. Ball, p. 209: "The point of the statement . . . very likely depends upon some fact unknown to us. Possibly Octavia, who was Claudius' grandmother on the mother's side, had been less pessimistic as to the boy's capabilities than Augustus and Livia."

6. Russo, p. 99: "Significa: 'parlerò solamente dei guai famigliari, che sono quelli che mi premono di più. Infatti, mentre mia sorella è di diverso parere, io so che è meglio pensare prima a sé e poi agli altri.' In bocca di Augusto tale apprezzamento nei riguardi di Ottavia (*soror mea*) è comico e si ritorce satiricamente su di lui, perché se Ottavia in tutta la sua vita di abnegazione si era sacrificata per gli altri, ciò era avvenuto massimamente per compiacere Augusto e nell'interesse di lui."

7. Russo, p. 100.

8. Russo suggests this emendation hesitantly in his early editions, but by the time of the fourth edition (1964), he would print it. Closer to the transmitted characters and worthy of serious consideration is Robert Graves's *surmea* (*συρμαία*), i.e., the radish, used by the Egyptians as a purge and emetic; see *Claudius the God* (London, 1934), p. 569.

9. J. P. Sullivan, "Seneca: The Deification of Claudius the Clod," *Arion*, V (1966), 389.

10. Rostagni, p. 69.

11. Plautus' *tunica propior palliost* (*Trin.* 1154), regularly cited as the Latin equivalent of *ἔγγιον γόνυ κνήμης* and "charity begins at home," is shown by its context to be capable of the same implication:

> *LY.* Charmidem socerum suom Lysiteles salutat. *CH.* di dent tibi, Lysiteles, quae velis. *CA.* non ego sum salutis dignus? *LY.* immo salve, Callicles; hunc priorem aequomst me habere: tunica propior palliost.

So, rightly, J. Ussing *ad loc.*: "Ut tunica corpori propior quam pallium est, ita socerum ceteris amicis propiorem videri dicit."

husband himself renounced the marriage.[12] (That Seneca's representation is an outrageous distortion of what Octavian's actual attitude had been is clear from the honors and privileges he lavished on his sister during this very period—statues, tribunician sacrosanctity, and the right to administer her own affairs without a guardian;[13] but such considerations are beside the point in satire.)

We return to the objections raised against Buecheler's *soror mea* and against Rostagni's interpretation of it, which must be met in the case of our modified interpretation as well.

(1) The emendation is doubtful and arbitrary. Short of confirmation by new manuscript evidence, few emendations are certain. In the present instance, however, not only is there an easy paleographical explanation for the original corruption, but, if such corruption be posited, the pattern of variants presented by the manuscripts is precisely what could be expected in view of current thinking concerning their relationship and idiosyncrasies (this arrived at, in large part, since Buecheler, who did not know L). All of our manuscripts, including ultimately the deteriores, are demonstrably derived from a single archetype—S, so it seems, directly, V and L through a common exemplar.[14] Presumably the archetype had *sormea* for *soror mea* by haplography of *or*. This was faithfully transmitted by S, but in the common exemplar of V and L (Russo's Γ) the nonsense word was copied as *formea* by confusion of *s* and *f*. This, in turn, was accurately transmitted by V, but the scribe of L, who appears occasionally to have introduced "corrections" in an effort to make sense of the text,[15] altered *f* to *ph*, perhaps looking for a proper name in the characters.

(2) An allusion by Augustus to the altruism of his sister or his twitting her about disloyalty would be injudicious. This is really no objection at all, since Augustus is being satirized by Seneca almost as much as Claudius is, though in a lower-keyed, more subtle manner; in fact this speech, with its parodies of Augustus' characteristic turns of phrase, is one of the finest parts of the whole satire. For a similarly injudicious allusion we have to look no farther than 10. 2, where Augustus recalls Messala Corvinus' *pudet imperii* (or whatever the original expression may have been),[16] a remark hardly flattering to himself in its implication.

(3) Such an allusion to Octavia's altruism or alleged disloyalty would be difficult for the reader to understand. Yet the background facts, at any rate, were apparently well known: Plutarch, in the chapter recounting Octavia's refusing to leave Antony's house and her continuing to look after his interests, observes that her actions had the unintended result of damaging her husband, since his wrongful treatment of her seemed all the more inexcusable.[17] For Octavia's behavior to have been an appreciable factor in influencing public opinion, it must have been something of a *cause célèbre*,[18] in which case recollection of it might be expected even in Seneca's time.

The real difficulty would seem to lie in deciding in which sense the proverb is being applied here and, hence, which of the two possible points the reference to Octavia has. Very likely, this is a question that Seneca, in dashing off his witty pasquinade, did not trouble to ask himself. The two meanings of the proverb are closely related, one being a specific aspect of the other. It is possible, for instance, that Seneca thought of the proverb first in its general sense of "me and mine first," and that this suggested its other sense of "the nearer relative first" and the rather unfair slap at Octavia. Such a procedure would be quite in keeping with the satire's casual, flippant manner and scattershot technique. Still, if a decision between the two

12. Plut. *Ant.* 54. 1–2.

13. Dio Cass. 49. 38. 1; cf. also Dio Cass. 49. 43. 8 and Suet. *Aug.* 61. 2.

14. Russo, pp. 27–33.

15. Cf. Russo, pp. 28–30.

16. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6. 11 and especially Hieron. *Chron.* on the year 1991 (= 26 B.C.): *incivilem potestatem esse contestans.*

17. *Ant.* 54. 2.

18. Octavian would have made the most of the situation in his propaganda campaign; in a related connection, Plutarch (*Ant.* 53. 1) reports that, according to the majority opinion, Octavian's motive in allowing Octavia to sail to Antony in 35 was to have a plausible pretext for war if she were scorned.

interpretations has to be made, the allusion to Octavia's alleged disloyalty would deserve preference as the more straightforward in its context. Further, only with this interpretation is the full humor in the mention of the two Julias and Silanus brought out: Octavia may have been vague about so simple a matter as the priority of duties owed a brother and a husband, but Augustus knows down to the last great-granddaughter and great-great-grandson (in that order)[19] the extent of the wrong that has been done him.[20]

THOMAS A. SUITS

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

19. Augustus' nicety in this respect is the more striking for the complexity of the relationships involved: the Julia who died by the sword was the daughter of Drusus Caesar, son of Tiberius, adoptive son of Augustus; Julia Livilla, who died by starvation, was the daughter of Germanicus Caesar, adoptive son of Tiberius, adoptive son of Augustus; and Lucius Silanus was descended from Augustus through an entirely female line—his mother was Aemilia Lepida, his grandmother was the younger Julia, and his great-grandmother was the elder Julia, daughter of Augustus.

20. I am indebted to Professors Michael P. McHugh and Allen M. Ward, who have kindly read and helpfully discussed with me a draft of this article.

FOUR NOTES ON PLAUTUS' *AVLVLARIA*

I

Aul. 141: tro[7]. The MSS give "nec tibi advorsari certum est de istac re umquam soror." Leo keeps this reading with hiatus after *re*, while Lindsay reads *re⟨d⟩*, adducing as evidence of this form *Merc.* 629, *Pseud.* 19, Pacuv. trag. 237. But most modern scholars doubt the existence of a fifth-declension ablative singular in *-d*, and one would do better to think of other possibilities. Wagner's (1st ed.) and Goetz's solution was to transpose *istac* and *re*, and this is certainly preferable to accepting the hiatus; but (see Lodge, I, 850) *iste* following the substantive to which it is joined is rare: only twenty-one examples in the whole of Plautus are noted by Lodge, and *re istac* is nowhere paralleled. Lindsay suggests *⟨n⟩umquam* in his apparatus (cf. his *⟨n⟩ullam* in 125), but I prefer to transpose *umquam* to a more normal position before *de istac re*; this does away with the hiatus and restores the normal order *istac re*: "nec tibi advorsari certumst umquam de istac re, soror.

II

Aul. 452: tro[7]. The MSS give "etiam intro duce si vis vel gregem venalium," with hiatus after *etiam*. Bothe, Wagner, Francken, and Goetz follow Camerarius in inserting a *⟨huc⟩* after *etiam*; Leo suggests *⟨ite⟩ etiam* in his apparatus, while both he and Lindsay accept the hiatus in their texts. Another possibility would be to read *⟨nunc⟩ etiam*, or better still *nunciam*: cf. 451 (where I find Leo's omission of *intro* preferable to Lindsay's *nunc[iam]*) and 453. Euclio, having retrieved the gold, says "*Now* you can all go in; *now* you can take the whole tribe of slaves in, if you like; *now* you can do all the hurrying about you like!"

There is a great deal to commend a series of three *nunciam*'s, not the least consideration being the clash of *etiam* and *vel*—which I cannot parallel—in the MSS. After a comma *etiam* would have to mean "also," which does not suit the context. *Nunciam*, in abbreviated form, could easily have been mistaken for *etiam*. I therefore read:

ite sane nunciam omnes, et coqui et tibicinae,
nunciam intro duce, si vis, vel gregem venalium,
coquite, facite, festinate nunciam quantum lubet
[451–53].

III

Aul. 69: the words *queo comminisci* begin 69 and 76, and this has caused some editors to suspect corruption. The hiatus (at caesura) after *queo comminisci* in 69, and the spondaic fourth foot *quicquam* in 76 increase the suspicion. (Add the fact that the sense of *comminisci—semper de fictis*, according to Lodge, I, 279—suits 76 well enough, but is a little awkward for 69.)

Now it is true that it is characteristic of