

Um so sicherer können wir aber sagen, daß dem Verfasser unseres Scholions die an der Textstelle berührten Sachverhalte unabhängig vom Text bekannt waren, und daß er dem Dichter zutraute, den Sachverhalt in der einzig richtigen, dem Fachmann bekannten Weise gemeint zu haben. Schon das läßt vermuten, daß das Scholion sehr alt ist. In § 3 gebraucht der Kommentator das Wort *ώρα* eindeutig im Sinn von Äquinoktialstunde; er begrenzt die zwei Stunden nicht mit Anfang und Ende des Krebsaufganges, wie Attalos, sondern mißt die ungefähre Dauer dieses Aufgangs mit abstrakten Stunden; das bedeutet, daß er unbeeinflusst war von Attalos, der die Deutung auf falsche Tierkreis-Doppelstunden aufbrachte, und auch unbeeinflusst von Hipparch, welcher die Interpretation des Attalos als solche bestätigt und damit zur herrschenden gemacht hat. Ein von diesen beiden Autoritäten unbeeinflusster Aratkommentar ist aber schon am Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. kaum noch vorstellbar. Schließlich sehen wir andererseits deutlich, wie der Kommentator den Dichter vor einem plumpen Angriff in Schutz nimmt; er will zeigen, daß die Wortverbindung *ὅσον ημῶν* bei Arat nicht sinnlos sei, eine Wortverbindung, die jemand dem Dichter mit solcher Bestimmtheit vorgeworfen haben muß, daß auch der Verteidiger meinte, die beiden Wörter zusammenziehen zu müssen – die man doch nur so lange für zusammengehörig halten konnte, als die bequeme Mißdeutung des Attalos noch nicht verbreitet war. Das Scholion scheint in eine allerälteste Schicht der Araterklärung, ins frühe 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr. zu gehören.

Freiburg i. Br.

Manfred Erren

### CICERO'S *CATO*\*

Cato's suicide in April, 46, provided republican sentiment with a martyr ever after. By the time the legend had exhausted itself, it had engendered tracts, countertracts, biographies, and

\* I owe much to the help of Prof. G. W. Bowersock of Harvard University, Prof. G. V. Sumner of University College, Toronto, and particularly Mr. J. E. G. Zetzel of Harvard University, whose work on Cicero's dialogues reached and amplified several of my own conclusions.

at least one play. Characteristically, the first man to see the possibilities was T. Pomponius Atticus, who passed the idea of writing something about Cato on to Cicero. Cicero liked the prospect, but it posed "a problem fit for an Archimedes", that of praising Cato without offending Atticus' Caesarian friends<sup>1</sup>). Somehow the difficulty was overcome, for Cicero was soon happily at work, and finished the piece within months of Cato's death. It elicited a prompt riposte from Caesar, who wrote the two books of his *Anticato* while encamped at Munda in the following March. In the literary battle that had just begun, Cato was to triumph easily over his detractors<sup>2</sup>).

Like almost all the literature about him, Cicero's tract on Cato has perished. Only three unhelpful fragments, amounting to less than fifty words, have been identified<sup>3</sup>). What follows is a study of those and two other possible fragments, and a hypothesis about the form that the *Cato* took.

### Fragments

1. A. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 13. 20. 14: *de (M. Catonis) uita laudibusque cum M. Tullius scriberet, pronepotem eum Catonis Censorii dixit fuisse.*

It can be presumed that the discussion of Cato's ancestry, a standard item both of funeral orations and of true biographies, came early in the *Cato*. Since the interlocutors in Gellius are certain that Cato was the Censor's great-grandson, but in disagreement about the intervening generations, it seems that Cicero did not go into detail but mentioned only the famous ancestor.

1) Cic., *ad Att.* 12. 4. 2. In the *Orator* (35), Cicero says that Brutus alone was responsible for his writing the *Cato*. The younger A. Caecina did not believe him (*ad fam.* 6. 7. 4.). For the *testimonia* and fragments the edition of F. Schoell, Vol. viii of the Teubner edition (1918), 488-492, is still the most satisfactory. The title *Cato* will be used throughout, as the one used by Cicero (*de div.* 2. 1. 3, *orator* 35, *ad Att.* 12. 4. 2, 12. 5. 2, 13. 27. 1, 13. 46. 2, *topica* 94) and the majority of later authors (Plut., *Cic.* 39. 6, *Caes.* 54. 5, *App., bell. civ.* 2. 99, Macrob., *Sat.* 6. 2. 33, schol. *Iuv.* 6. 338, p. 95 Wessner). The title *laus Catonis* given by A. Gellius (*Noct. Att.* 13. 20. 3) must be due to early copyists, like the change reported by Suetonius, *de gramm.* p. 23 Brugnoli.

2) On the Cato literature generally, see H. Bardon, *La Littérature latine inconnue* I (1952), 276-281 and (with errors) R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (1966), 5.

3) On these, see below, p. 189ff.

2. Macrobius, *Sat.* 6. 2. 33. *In Catone Ciceronis* —: *contingebat in eo quod plerisque contra solet, ut maiora omnia re quam fama uiderentur; id quod non saepe euenit, ut expectatio (a) <sup>4</sup>) cognitione, aures ab oculis uincerentur.*

Although the context cannot be determined, this is the longest and most revealing of the fragments, and the only one to show the laudatory nature of the *Cato*. It also prompts reflection about Sallust's characterization of Cato in the *Bellum Catilinae*, written only four or so years later, where a not dissimilar tribute is made to him: *esse quam uideri bonus malebat; ita quo minus petebat gloriam eo magis illum assequebatur*<sup>5</sup>). Sallust can hardly have failed to read Cicero's *Cato*, especially since it must have discussed, as Brutus' did, the debate of 5th. December, 63<sup>6</sup>). It is in the context of that debate that Sallust himself makes the formal comparison of Caesar and Cato from which this description comes<sup>7</sup>). The influence of Cicero is all the more likely in that it was his *Cato* that, explicitly or implicitly, began the literary confrontation of the two men.

3. Priscian, *Inst. Gramm.*, *GLK* II 510. 19. *Cicero in Catone maiore: ignoturum alteri quod patrem*<sup>8</sup>), *alteri quod tutorem secutus esset.*

These words do not occur in the *Cato maior*, and Priscian has clearly confused the two works. Here speculation about the context might be more fruitful. The accusative of the participle and the subjunctives imply that this is a fragment of *oratio obliqua*, and style suggests that the *pater* and the *tutor* are one person, who is likely to be Cato, though it is unclear whether Cato was also the subject of *ignoturum*. It is therefore possible that the reference is to Utica<sup>9</sup>). Among those that remained behind with Cato after the evacuation, the tradition singles out his son and a youthful

4) The supplement is clearly required, and goes back at least as far as Lambinus (1565). It is not mentioned in J. Willis' edition of Macrobius (1963).

5) Sall., *Bell. Cat.* 54. 6. On the date of this work, see R. Syme, *Sallust* (1964), 128.

6) Cic., *ad Att.* 12. 21. 1.

7) Sall., *Bell. Cat.* 54.

8) Schoell, *op. cit.* (n. 1) 492, by mistake printed *patri* for *patrem*. In the edition of the fragments by I. Puccioni, *M. Tulli Ciceronis orationum perditarum fragmenta* (1963), 169, Schoell's slip is retained as if it were in the text of Priscian.

9) This was already supposed by F. Schneider, *Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft* 4 (1837), 1148. But his suggestion that the first *alter* referred to M. Favonius was based on a misreading of *tutorem* as *fautorem*.

follower called Statilius, who later died at Philippi<sup>10</sup>). These may be the two persons forgiven, though there is no other evidence that Statilius was Cato's ward; the forgiver could be Cato himself, allowing the two to remain with him, or perhaps Caesar.

To these three, long since collected, two more may be added from Plutarch's *Life of Cato*. That is not to say that Plutarch necessarily read the work for himself; but since he knew of it and he or his source made extensive use of Caesar's *Anticato*<sup>11</sup>), traces of the *Cato* might be expected in his own biography of the same man.

After narrating how Cato failed to be elected in 52 to the consulate for the following year, Plutarch describes Cato's apparent indifference to his defeat, and continues<sup>12</sup>): αἰτιᾶται δὲ Κικέρων ὅτι, τῶν πραγμάτων ἄρχοντος τοιοῦτου δεομένων, οὐκ ἐποίησατο σπουδὴν, οὐδ' ὑπήλθεν ὀμιλία φιλανθρωπῶπι τὸν δῆμον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν ἐξέκαμε καὶ ἀπηγόρευσε, καίτοι τὴν στρατηγίαν αἰθῆς ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς μετελθών. ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Κάτων ὅτι τῆς μὲν στρατηγίας οὐ κατὰ γνώμην ἐξέπεσε τῶν πολλῶν, κτλ. The second of these two sentences, that beginning ἔλεγεν οὖν, has been considered from the time of the earliest translators on to be Cato's reply to the accusation of Cicero contained in the first<sup>13</sup>), and as a result no attention has been paid to the source of Cicero's statement itself. But the tense of αἰτιᾶται in itself shows that Plutarch is drawing on a work of literature<sup>14</sup>); and moreover ἔλεγεν ὁ Κάτων ought not to mean "Cato replied", but rather "Cato maintained". If it is translated thus, and οὖν is given its resumptive force, "at any rate"<sup>15</sup>), then this second sentence fits into place: it is Cato's

10) Plut., *Cato min.* 65.9-12. On Statilius see Münzer, *R.-E.* iii A, 2185 no. 2.

11) Plutarch and the *Cato*: *Cic.* 39.6, *Caes.* 54.5. Plutarch and the *Anticato*: *Cic.* 39.6, *Caes.* 3.4. To the fragments of the *Anticato* in Plutarch collected by A. Klotz, *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii* iii (1927), 189-190, *Cato min.* 57.4 should perhaps be added.

12) Plut., *Cato min.* 50.2-3.

13) Crusenius (p. 783 E of the Frankfurt edition, 1620), "culpat eum Cicero... at Cato... respondit"; the Langhorns (*Plutarch's Lives* v [1770], 95), "Cicero... blamed [the change of tense is instructive] his insolence... Cato answered..."; Bernadotte Perrin (*Plutarch's Lives* viii [1919], 357), "Cicero finds fault with him... Cato replied, accordingly...".

14) For this use of αἰτιόμαι cf. Plut., *Per.* 25.1, *Caes.* 48.5. H. Peter, *Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Biographien der Römer* (1865, repr. 1965), 67, clearly considered Cicero's charge to have been contained in a written work, but did not ask which.

15) For this use of οὖν instead of the more frequent δ' οὖν cf. Plut.,



explanation of his failure in 52, and not an answer to Cicero's charge that he ought to have run again. The first sentence can therefore be detached from its context as a statement of Cicero to which Plutarch or his source had access. While it might be from a letter, the fact that it concerns Cato's career, and seems to be written after Cato's death, shows that its source can scarcely be other than a work to which Plutarch refers elsewhere, the lost *Cato*.

If that is accepted, another quotation from Cicero in the same book of Plutarch's *Lives* can be considered. The twin biographies of Phocion and the younger Cato are prefaced with an introduction in which Plutarch compares his two subjects, and again quotes Cicero on Cato<sup>16</sup>): ὁ μὲν Κικέρων φησὶν αὐτὸν ὡσπερ ἐν τῇ Πλάτωνος πολιτείᾳ καὶ οὐκ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμόλων πολιτευόμενον ὑποστάθμη τῆς ὑπατείας ἐκπεσεῖν. This is usually held to be a misquotation of a well known criticism of Cato in the *Letters to Atticus*<sup>17</sup>), *dicit ... tamquam in Platonis πολιτείᾳ, non tamquam in Romuli faece, sententiam*. But there is an obvious discrepancy. The observation reported in this preface, like that in the *Life of Cato* following, concerns Cato's attempt to be elected consul in 52, whereas the letter to Atticus was written in 60 and has nothing to do with candidacy for office<sup>18</sup>). Plutarch's memory could be at fault, but there is no need to assume so. Cicero was not one to throw his epigrams away lightly, and indeed this one turns up again in an altered form in the *de oratore*<sup>19</sup>). It has already been argued that in his account of the year 52 Plutarch had access to Cicero's *Cato*. This too must be a quotation from the same work, and indeed from the same context within it.

One objection must be met here. Cicero's *Cato* is commonly regarded as an unreserved eulogy, "ein Protest gegen die Politik Caesars", which Cicero wrote when "for once considerations of expediency meant nothing to him"<sup>20</sup>). The two fragments now claimed for the *Cato*, however, tax their subject for his lack of

---

*Per.* 23.3, where Perrin rightly translates (*op. cit.* [n. 13] iii [1916], 67), "however that may be...".

16) Plut., *Phoc.* 3.2.

17) Cic., *ad Att.* 2.1.8.

18) This was already noticed by Xylander in the Frankfurt edition of 1620 (p. 49 of the *Annotationes*).

19) *De or.* 1.230.

20) K. Büchner, *R.-E.* vii A, 1272; J. P. V. D. Balsdon *apud* T. A. Dorey, *Cicero* (1965), 184.

pragmatism and perseverance. They might seem to have no place in a eulogy.

Caution is necessary. The other fragments of the work, it has been seen, are too meagre to permit any secure judgment about its tone. Though Cicero calls it a *laudatio*, the notion that it was extravagantly encomiastic derives in the main from Tacitus, who says that in it Cicero "Catonem caelo aequavit"<sup>21</sup>). That description, however, occurs in the speech of Cremutius Cordus on trial for *maiestas*, where the context demanded the sharpest contrast between Cicero's provocation and Caesar's imperturbability. That the *Cato* was not in fact entirely favourable to its subject is suggested by the reaction that it evoked. Caesar, though he was stung into writing a riposte, reserved his malice for Cato, and Cicero's trepidation turned to pleasant surprise as he found himself covered with praise in Caesar's preface<sup>22</sup>). One detail of it in particular, a comparison of Cicero with Pericles and Themistocles, appears to allude to Cicero's political flexibility<sup>23</sup>). But while Caesar was ready to let Cicero off lightly, Brutus was annoyed. He wrote his own *Cato*; Cicero was enraged by the version it gave of the Nones of December, and Caesar took the opportunity to observe that the style was far inferior to that of Cicero's piece<sup>24</sup>).

If Cicero's *Cato* did not meet with the reception of an outright eulogy of the deceased, that is not surprising. The discreet Atticus of all people was the least likely to suggest something that might seem to be an attack on the *status quo*. His promptings would have been furthered by the inclinations of Cicero himself. The same inflexibility that Cato had shown in 52 and at Utica had in the past wrecked schemes of Cicero's own; now the praetorian was a martyr, the consular a collaborator. The critical tone of these two fragments, therefore, so far from being discordant with the *Cato*, in fact harmonises with it. If they and the arguments about their placing are accepted, the order will be as follows. 1: A. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 13. 20. 14. 2: Macrobius, *Sat.* 6. 2. 33. 3: Plutarch, *Cato minor* 50. 2. 4: Plutarch, *Phocion* 3. 2. 5: Priscian, *GLK* II 510. 19.

21) Tac., *Ann.* 4. 34. 4.

22) See Cic., *ad Att.* 12. 40. 1, 13. 46. 2.

23) Plut., *Cic.* 39. 5 = fr. 3 Klotz.

24) Cic., *ad Att.* 12. 21. 1, 13. 46. 2.

## Form

The supposition that the *Cato* was less than entirely favourable to its subject may receive some support from a consideration of its literary form. References to its laudatory nature have caused it to be placed among Cicero's *orationes scriptae*, like the *laudatio Porciae* written in 45<sup>25</sup>). The fact that it is also called a *uita*, however, shows that it was not merely a literary funeral oration, but rather a biography. The surviving fragments would comport with the notion that it was a chronological narrative generally favourable to its subject in the manner of Xenophon's *Agésilas*, a work that Cicero much admired<sup>26</sup>), or Nepos' *Life of Atticus* written only about ten years after the *Cato*.

That conception of the *Cato* may yet be wrong. The scholiast of Juvenal makes a surprising assertion<sup>27</sup>): *Caesar bello civili cognita Catonis morte, cuius uirtutem dialogo illo cui inscripsit Cato Cicero etiam laudauit, duos libros famosissimos in uitam Catonis edidit quos Anticatones inscripsit*. The errors of these scholia are notorious, and this very sentence falsely implies that Caesar wrote the *Anticato* at the moment of hearing of Cato's death. The statement that the *Cato* was a dialogue has accordingly been overlooked or rejected by the majority, though accepted once or twice in the last century, which is all the more surprising in that evidence which might support it has only appeared since 1900<sup>28</sup>). It is time to reconsider the scholiast's assertion, with a preliminary glance at the phenomenon of dialogue-biography.

For a long time this by-form of biography was believed only a late mutation that the species underwent at the end of its classical history, in the Christian era. The earliest and most important of these Christian works is the *Dialogi* of Sulpicius Severus, written as a supplement to his life of St. Martin of Tours in the late fourth century<sup>29</sup>). While the only known examples were Chris-

---

25) Thus in Schoell's edition of the fragments, *op. cit.* (n. 1), followed by I. Puccioni, *op. cit.* (n. 8).

26) Cic., *ad Q. fr.* 1. 2. 7, *ad fam.* 5. 12. 7.

27) Schol. Iuv. 6. 338, p. 95 Wessner.

28) Rejected among others by Klotz, *op. cit.* (n. 11), 187; accepted by C. A. F. Brückner, *Leben des M. Tullius Cicero* i (1852), 634, and only reluctantly disbelieved by R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog* i (1895), 513 n. 3.

29) The standard edition is that of C. Halm, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* i (1866), 152-216; there is an English translation, with useful notes, by B. M. Peebles, *The Fathers of the Church* vii (1949),

tian, there was little temptation to believe that Cicero's *Cato* had also been a dialogue. In 1912, however, the publication of fragments of Satyrus' *Life of Euripides* revealed that this biographer of the third century B.C. had used the same method<sup>30</sup>). Here Satyrus appears as the chief interlocutor, talking with friends about Euripides in a way that is consistently favourable to his memory<sup>31</sup>). It is clear that, as a Peripatetic, Satyrus was in the tradition of Aristotle, who was both a writer of dialogues and one of the first methodical investigators into the lives of individuals. That Satyrus should have written his biographies in dialogue form is therefore not completely surprising. What demands explanation is the fact that this strange hybrid of dialogue-biography should appear in the third century B.C. and the fourth century A.D. with no sign of a connection between them<sup>32</sup>). It is here, in the gap between Satyrus and Sulpicius Severus, that Cicero's *Cato* may perhaps belong.

*Prima facie* Cicero might well be argued to have been influenced by Hellenistic models into writing his *Cato* in dialogue form. The indebtedness of his extant dialogues to Aristotle is acknowledged by himself, and apparent from their design, in which the author is often the chief speaker and the conversation proceeds by long exposition rather than brief Platonic exchanges<sup>33</sup>). Besides that, there is the explicit testimony of the scholiast that the *Cato* was a dialogue. But the notion that Cicero's *Cato* might in turn have influenced the *Dialogi* of Sulpicius Severus might seem a hypothesis founded on a hypothesis. It is only possible to proceed by bearing in mind such evidence as there is that the *Cato* was a dialogue, and considering the *Dialogi* for any traces that Cicero's work might have left.

When the reader does this, certain otherwise trivial things catch his attention. The first is that in the opening pages Sulpicius actually mentions the younger Cato making his march across

161-251. On these Christian productions generally, see P.R. Coleman-Norton, *J. T. S.* 27 (1926), 388-395.

30) *Pap. Oxyrh.* ix (1912), 124-182, no. 1176, most recently edited by G. Arrighetti, *Studi classici ed orientali* xiii (1964).

31) On the interlocutors of the dialogue see D.R. Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography* (1928), 180 n. 48, Arrighetti, *op. cit.* (n. 30), 133-134.

32) Stuart, *op. cit.* (n. 31), 180, notes the phenomenon, but does not attempt to trace a connection.

33) Cic., *ad fam.* 1.9.23 (of the *de oratore*), *ad Att.* 13.19.4. See Hirzel, *op. cit.* (n. 28), 276, A.E. Douglas, *Brutus* (1966), xvii n. 1.



the African desert as he retreated before Caesar<sup>34</sup>). Further on Sulpicius recounts a miracle of Martin effected through the agency of a deacon called Cato<sup>35</sup>); this detail of course proves nothing by itself, but might possibly be construed in conjunction with other evidence as an allusion, deliberate or unconscious, to Sulpicius' exemplar. Lastly, at the end of the dialogue Sulpicius urges his friend Postumianus, who is about to set sail for the East, to visit there the grave of a mutual friend who is buried by the edge of the sea (*in extremo litore*), covered by the sand of a foreign shore (*ignoti pulueris syrte*); and Sulpicius appeals to his enemies to behold their triumph (*uideant gloriam suam*) and their revenge, whereupon the company departs in tears and the dialogue ends<sup>36</sup>). Now the younger Cato, as it happens, was also buried by the sea, *παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν* in Plutarch's words<sup>37</sup>), and so himself "covered by the sand of a foreign shore"; and indeed the whole passage could be supposed to have been modelled with appropriate alterations on an emotional close to Cicero's *Cato*.

To return finally to the genesis of the *Cato*, it is not hard to see how making the work a dialogue would have helped Cicero with the *πρόβλημα Ἀρχιμήδειον*. By introducing different speakers, he could share with others the burden of praising and blaming Cato<sup>38</sup>). It has already been seen from the quotations in Plutarch that the *Cato* is likely to have done both. Nevertheless, the arguments used to identify those fragments are independent of any argument about the work's form, and similarly the scholiast's statement that the *Cato* was a dialogue might be right even if the thesis be rejected that Sulpicius Severus modelled his own *Dialogi* on it. But it would be apt that in canonizing a Stoic martyr Cicero should have influenced the biographer of a Christian saint<sup>39</sup>).

University College, Toronto

C. P. Jones

34) *Dialogi* 1. 3. 6. Peebles, however (*op. cit.* [n. 29], 165 n. 5), points out that Lucan had given a vivid description of this march, *Phars.* 9. 368 ff.

35) *Dialogi* 3. 10. 2.

36) *Dialogi* 3. 18. But the same passage also contains an imitation of Vergil, *Aen.* 6. 884 ff (Peebles, *op. cit.* [n. 29], 251 n. 3).

37) Plut., *Cato min.* 71. 3.

38) This argument was already advanced by Brückner, *op. cit.* (n. 28), *ibid.*

39) Cf. Lucan, *Phars.* 9. 603 f, addressing Rome: *quem (Catonem, sc.) si steteris umquam cervice soluta nunc, olim, factura deum es*. On the figure of the younger Cato in Christian writers, see A. Hermann, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 2 (1954), 937-940.