

NOTES ON CICERO, *IN PISONEM**)

14. *Idem illo fere biduo productus in contionem ab eo cui †sic equatum† praebebas consulatum tuum etc.*

The third-person reference is to Clodius, as it is also at the beginning of the next section (15) *eum cui tu senatus auctoritatem, salutem civitatis, totam rem publicam ... vendidisti*. That and similar passages (some of them quoted by N.) suggest that the corruption conceals a word like *venditum* or *addictum* or *emancipatum*. Various such proposals have been made, but none is palaeographically plausible. Much more plausible, even if a weaker word, would be *obsequentem*; for the combination of *praebere* with a present participle compare Off. 1. 132 *ut ... appetitum rationi oboedientem praebeamus*.

23. *An ego consulem esse putem qui senatum esse in re publica non putavit, et sine eo consilio consulem numerem sine quo Romae ne reges quidem esse potuerunt? Etenim illa iam omitto. Cum servorum dilectus haberentur in foro, ... tum Romae fuisse consules quisquam existimabit?*

The short sentence introduced by *etenim* cannot be sound. *Illa* has no satisfactory point of reference; it cannot refer to what immediately precedes because, so far from dropping this point (that Piso and Gabinius do not deserve the name of consuls), it is precisely this point which Cicero goes on to develop in the very long sentence which follows. For the same reason *etenim* (which has aroused suspicion) would be much more convincing if it introduced this long sentence than it is in its present function; if *illa iam omitto* did not appear in the manuscripts it would not be missed.

Müller proposed *ut enim alia iam omittam, cum* etc. This, as

*) I am very grateful to Professor Nisbet for commenting on the suggestions made in this article.

N. = M. Tulli Ciceronis in L. Calpurnium Pisonem oratio, ed. R. G. M. Nisbet (Oxford, 1961); unless otherwise stated, I take my lemmata from this edition. Other editions referred to are those of Faernus (1563), Ernesti (1773), Garatoni (1788), Orelli (1826), Halm (1856), R. Klotz (ed. 2, 1867), Müller (1893), A. Klotz (1919).

N. says, gives excellent sense, but is somewhat remote from the manuscripts. However, the same result can be achieved much more economically: read *etenim (alia iam omitto) cum etc.*

24. *Magnum nomen est, magna species, magna dignitas, magna maiestas consulis; non capiunt angustiae pectoris tui, non recipit levitas ista; non egestas animi, non infirmitas ingeni sustinet, non insolentia rerum secundarum tantam personam, tam gravem, tam severam.*

secundarum efX: *scarium* E

Piso had been elected to the quaestorship, aedileship, praetorship, and consulship, all at his first attempt (§ 2); how then can Cicero include his unfamiliarity with *success* among the factors which unfit him for the consulship? Not without reason has *secundarum* been suspected, but neither of the two suggestions recorded by A. Klotz, *salutarium* and *sanctarum*, deserves consideration; what is wanted is an adjective of the same general meaning as *magnus* or *gravis*. Perhaps *excelsarum*; Piso is alleged to lack that *magnificentia* which Cicero (Inv. 2. 163) defines as *rerum magnarum et excelsarum cum animi ampla quadam et splendida propositione cogitatio atque administratio*. This quality is an essential requisite in the holders of any public office (Off. 1. 72 *capessentibus . . . rem publicam . . . magnificentia . . . adhibenda*), and particularly of the consulship, *hanc excelsissimam sedem dignitatis atque honoris* (Sull. 5).

It is clear that the reading of Ω was a contraction of *secundarum*, which E has mistaken for a contraction of *saecularium*; for the similarity of the two contractions see D. Bains, Supplement to Notae Latinae, Cambridge 1936, 43. The progression *excels-* > *escels-* > *secd-* or *scd-* is not inconceivable.

25. *Me et praesentem contra latrocinium tuum suis decretis legatisque defenderant et absentem principe Cn. Pompeio referente et de corpore rei publicae tuorum scelerum tela revellente revocarunt.*

“Early in 57 the local council at Capua, on the motion of Pompey, who was *duumvir*, passed a motion in favour of Cicero’s recall. . . . The resolution at Capua was the first of many throughout Italy. . . . In our passage it is a little awkward to interpret *principe* as ‘first in Italy’ rather than ‘first in Capua’” (N. ad loc.). The awkwardness can easily be eliminated (and the balance of the sentence improved) by emending *principe* to *principes*

with Garatoni. The sense 'first in Capua' is adequately expressed by *referente* alone; *principi* is both otiose and unexampled in this common phrase. Garatoni's suggestion is recorded (with unjustified disapproval) by Orelli and by Halm, but by no subsequent editor.

34. *Me Kalendis Ianuariis, qui dies post obitum occasumque [vestrum] rei publicae primus inluxit, frequentissimus senatus ... revocavit.*

vestrum PVE: *nostrum* X: om. ef

The deletion of *vestrum*, accepted by N., has not met with the approval it deserves.

Immediately before and immediately after this sentence Cicero addresses Piso; hence *vestrum*, if genuine, must refer to the consuls Piso and Gabinius, not (as Halm and A. Klotz) to the senate, and *obitum occasumque* is a metaphor for their demission of office on 29 December 58 B. C. Cicero will then be saying that 1 January 57 was the first day that dawned on Rome after 29 December 58: true, but utterly banal. This is the most convincing reason for deleting *vestrum* as a misconceived gloss, but there is also some substance in Orelli's point that the consuls' star by no means set when they demitted office at Rome since they both went on to govern provinces.

With *vestrum* deleted, *rei publicae* is a genitive, and Cicero is saying that 1 January 57 was the first real day that dawned since the events in the early months of 58 which culminated in his own exile; these events he has already described (§ 18) as *occasum atque interitum rei publicae*. For the expression compare also Sull. 33 *occasum interitumque rei publicae*; Catil. 3. 19 *totius urbis atque imperi occasum*. By contrast, Cicero never uses *occasus* of individuals except in two passages (Ac. 1. 8, Hort. frg. 97) where it is a synonym of *mors* and at Top. 32 *senectutem occasum vitae ... definire*.

54. *Scio item virum fortem, in primis belli ac rei militaris peritum, familiarem meum Q. Marcium ... domi fuisse otiosum.*

N.'s punctuation (*in primis* with what follows) is certainly right. An additional point in its favour is the fact that, when *in primis* is combined with an adjective in Cicero, it normally (with a few exceptions in the *Philosophica*) precedes the adjective. Indeed, it is quite possible that *et* has dropped out after *fortem*; cf. Fam. 3.6.5 *virum fortem mihi in primis probatum*; Att. 15. 13.

3 *Peducaei auctoritatem magnam quidem apud me et in primis gravem.*

66–67. *Luxuriam autem nolite in isto hanc cogitare (est enim quaedam, quamquam omnis est vitiosa atque turpis, tamen ingenuo ac libero dignior): nihil apud hunc lautum, nihil elegans, nihil exquisitum.*

So I would punctuate. With the ordinary punctuation (no parenthesis) *hanc* causes trouble. Cicero intended *hanc cogitare: lautam, elegantem, exquisitam*, but after the parenthesis (as not infrequently) he changes the formulation, repeating both the negative idea (*nolite, nihil*) and the designation of the person (*in isto, apud hunc*). These repetitions are illogical but rhetorically effective.

67. *Panis et vinum a propola atque de cupa; Graeci stipati quini in lectulis, saepe plures; ipse solus; bibitur usque eo dum de solio ministretur.*

If *solio* is sound, the only credible explanation of the word is that which lurks in the 'Prooemium' of R. Klotz's edition: 'solum eius modi vas fuit quod ei vasi unde vinum fundebatur supponi solebat quo colligeretur si quid redundaret; itaque, ubi iam ipsa vasa vacuefacta erant, de solio ministrabatur illud quod confluxerat.' Unfortunately no supporting evidence is produced.

If *solio* is corrupt, it has presumably come from the preceding *solus* and the word which it has supplanted need not bear a close resemblance to it. An obvious possibility is *faece*; cf. Brut. 244 *de faece . . . hauris* (metaphorical); Seneca Ep. 58. 32 *ille ultra modum deditus vino est qui amphoram exsiccat et faecem quoque exsorbet*; and Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, Carm. 1. 35. 27.

68. *Is (sc. Philodemus) cum istum adolescentem (sc. Pisonem) iam tum hac distracta fronte vidisset, non fastidivit eius amicitiam.*

Faernus explained *distracta fronte* by a reference to § 14 *altero ad frontem sublato, altero ad mentum depresso supercilio*: Piso's forehead is 'torn apart' by his raising one eyebrow and lowering the other. The expression does not occur elsewhere; one might expect it to mean the opposite of *contracta fronte* ('frowning'), but this can hardly be so because elsewhere Cicero mentions a frown as characteristic of Piso's facial appearance (Sest. 19 *tanta contractio frontis*; Red. in sen. 15 *vos populumque Romanum . . . rugis supercilioque decepit*). This is pointed out by R. Kassel (Rh. Mus. 106 [1963] 305f.), who therefore suggests that *distracta*

should be *distorta*. If emendation is called for, I should prefer *adstricta*, comparing Martial 11. 39. 13 *adstricta fronte*; Seneca, Ep. 106. 5 *an frontem adstringant*; Quint. 11. 3. 160 *vultum ... quo sit magis torvus superciliis adstringere*. Compounds in *ad-* and *di-* are sometimes confused, e. g. Off. 3. 113 *distringit/adstringit*.

80. ... *Cn. Pompeius ... cum municipia pro me adiret, Italiae fidem imploraret, P. Lentulo consuli, auctori salutis meae, frequens adsideret, senatus sententiam praestaret, in contionibus non modo se defensorem salutis meae sed etiam supplicem pro me profiteretur etc.*

senatus P: senatui Ω

The phrase *senatus sententia* occurs in nine other Ciceronian passages:

(a) In seven of these *ex* (or *de*) *senatus sententia* is used. In each case the reference is to a *senatus consultum*, but whether *sententia* is concrete (a synonym of *consultum*) or abstract ('will', 'view') it is impossible to tell; Mommsen's statement (*Staatsrecht* III, 996, 4) that "*senatus sententia* abstract kommt nicht vor" is unjustified.

(b) Cato 16 *cum sententia senatus inclinaret ad pacem ... foedusque faciendum*; this is a clear instance of *sententia* abstract.

(c) Phil. 11. 9 *cunctis senatus sententiis hostis est iudicatus*.

None of these passages lends support to *senatus sententiam praestaret*, especially since the meaning of the verb is far from clear. By contrast, *senatui* yields good sense ('gave the senate the benefit of his opinion') and (as N. points out) clearly brings out the parallelism between the senate and the *contiones*. The final *s* in P's reading may well have come from the first letter of *sententiam*.

87. *Quid? vectigalem provinciam, singulis rebus quaecumque venirent certo portorio imposito, servis tuis [publicanis] a te factam esse meministi?*

The deletion of *publicanis*, as an erroneous gloss on *servis tuis*, was first suggested by Ernesti and has been adopted by most later editors. The gloss has presumably supplanted a word which served as predicate to *factam esse*; the omission would be all the easier if that word bore some sort of resemblance to *publicanis* or to a contraction thereof. This criterion might be satisfied by *peculium*, which makes good sense in the context.

97. *Qui si nihil gesseras dignum honore, ubi exercitus, ubi sumptus? ... sin autem aliquid speraveras, cogitaras id quod imperatoris nomen, quod laureati fasces ... te commentatum esse declarant, quis te miserior etc.*

speraveras Bake: *sperare volueras* Ω

Bake's conjecture certainly avoids the objections to the manuscript reading which are pointed out by N., but is palaeographically somewhat implausible. Perhaps *sperare coeperas*; cf. Cluent. 36 *Oppianicus continuo sperare coepit etc.*

Aberdeen

W. S. Watt

THE LATE ANTIQUE TRADITION OF VARRO'S *ONOS LYRAS*

I

That we have lost almost all the main works of Marcus Terentius Varro is an unfortunate accident of literary textual transmission. Except for the *De re rustica* and the *De lingua Latina*, the modern reader sees his work through a glass darkly in the writings of a series of opponents and compilers. Instead of dealing with the more famous theological writings, this paper will examine a feature of the transmission of the *Menippeae* in the hope that at least one example of a different approach to the fragments of these works may generate interest in a new way of reconstructing lost material.

We owe the *Menippeae* mainly to the efforts of Nonius Marcellus, the 4th century African lexicographer¹). In them he found a rich source of rare vocabulary, and he cited them frequently. In all we have about six hundred fragments. Thanks to the ingenuity of Lindsay, it is often possible to apply his *lex* to Nonius's method of

1) Nonius's *floruit* is placed c. 323 A.D. on the basis of CIL VIII 4878, an inscription from Thubursicum Numidarum. The subscription to the *De compendiosa doctrina* calls him *peripateticus Tubursicensis*. If one does not accept the identification of the donor of the baths and our lexicographer, one may still establish that he worked after Gellius and before Priscian.