QUO USQUE TANDEM . . . ?

If any words are unmistakably Ciceronian, these are. Every schoolboy knew them. Generations of Latin prose composers have trotted them out with unassailable confidence. It seems almost indelicate to suggest that they are not Ciceronian at all; but it would solve the problem presented by Sallust *Cat.* 20.9 if this were the case. Sallust's placing of the hallowed words in the mouth of Catiline has always been something of a scandal, to be laughed off (if you can find a joke in it), or played down (Syme, *Sallust*, p.106, 'If that is malice, it is not very noxious'), or turned round (D. C. Innes, *CQ* 27 (1977), 468, '*mimesis* is regularly a compliment to the author imitated, often closely functional'). All the fidgeting would stop if we supposed that, far from Sallust pulling Cicero's leg, Cicero was pulling Catiline's, twitting him, devastatingly, with one of his own characteristic phrases. One can hardly imagine a more effective opening gambit.

Argument must start from the lexicography of the phrase, and from the fact that the 'Ciceronianism' *quo usque tandem* occurs only here in Cicero: elsewhere he contents himself with *quo usque* as a *vox reprehendentis*. So the full phrase is in some way special to the occasion. The phrase is, in fact, very rare in Classical Latin, and its context significant. It occurs exactly once apiece in Cicero, Sallust, Livy: in a speech to Catiline (*in Cat.* 1.1), in a speech by Catiline (*B.C.* 20.9), and in a Catiline-style speech by Manlius (Livy 6.18.5; for echoes of Catiline in the speech, see Seager, *CQ* N.S. 27 (1977), 383). The common factor is obviously Catiline, and one is drawn to conclude that the phrase is his, and was recognized to be his by both Sallust and Livy. As for Cicero, other people's prose, as well as his own, got the benefit of his critical attention, and their stylistic eccentricities are allowed to provide ammunition for attacking them. Mostly we can only know this is happening when he tells us so, e.g. in the *Philippics* where he mocks Antony's Latin (3.12–2, 13.43); so direct evidence is meagre, and certainly no parallel to the present case proposes itself (and perhaps none need be sought; it would be an unrepeatable coup). What drew his attention to the phrase in the first place is hard to say. Did it strike him as tautological? or illogical? At any rate, it was, as we have seen, not an accepted idiom, and perhaps this was enough. Better still, it was a key phrase (cf. *pro Sestio*, 22, 'sermo nobis ansas dabat, quibus reconditos eius sensus tenere possemus'): if evidence for Catiline's use of these words is meagre, the mood they represent is central to the character of this impatient, much frustrated man (e.g. *B.C.* 20.10, 20.14, 27.4, 35.3, 58.4), and, one way or another, the senate would recognize the reference and see its point ('Fed up? We all are . . . with you!').

People who live in glass-houses shouldn't throw stones. Such a *tour de force* would help to explain the glee with which Cicero's enemies tried to play the same kind of trick on him, quoting in derision from the *de consulatu* and taunting him with 'comperi'. The game required little subtlety: Cicero could be counted on to rise to the bait. A passage from *pro Plancio* suggests a refinement of the torture. In §75 he takes exception to a word addressed to him by his opponent Laterensis; the commentators find him muddled and illogical, and the reader is certainly left wondering what he is making all the fuss about. The

word is *quousque*, and Cicero finds its use malicious: '<mihi> dici "quousque" irridentis magis est quam reprehendentis'. If he suspects Laterensis of tantalizing him with a half quotation of *quo usque tandem*, then his confusion is easily explained: he is incapable of saying nothing, but is afraid to say too much in case he has imagined the whole thing. If in addition the original words are Catiline's, he has to decide whether to be as insulted, more insulted, or less insulted than if the words had been his own.

University of Glasgow D. A. MALCOLM

HORACE AND THE SIBYL (*EPODE* 16.2)

It seems clear that Virgil, Horace, and Tibullus knew, if not the third *Sibylline Oracle* itself, prophecies like it.[1] An unnoticed parallel between that work and Horace may confirm this conclusion and afford a small insight into the Latin poet's art.

Or. Sib. 3.363–4: (cf. 8.165–6)	ἔσται καὶ Σάμος ἄμμος, ἐσεῖται Δῆλος ἄδηλος, καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη . . .
Epod. 16.2:	suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit.

Both *Roma* and *viribus* correspond to Ῥώμη: Horace is playing on the identity of Ῥώμη and ῥώμη in Greek,[2] a pun perhaps implicit in the passage from the Sibyllines too.[3] *Ruit* corresponds to ῥύμη; exactly what kind of correspondence this is depends on the meaning of ῥύμη. Two senses are possible:

(1) 'A ruin'; cf. Nikiprowetzky:[4] 'Rome une ruine'. It looks as though Lactantius took the word to mean this: 'at vero cum caput illud orbis *occiderit* et ῥύμη esse coeperit, quod Sibyllae fore aiunt . . .' (*Div. Inst.* 7.25.7). I know of no other example of ῥύμη = *ruina*; and the word does not apparently recur in the *Sibyllines*. But such an extension of sense, perhaps under the influence of the Latin word, from ῥύμη = 'impetus, rush'[5] is not difficult; and the need for a word that would make a pun with Ῥώμη would have encouraged it.

(2) 'a (mere/single) street'; cf. Kurfess:[6] 'Rom wird sein eine Gasse'. This is a common meaning of ῥύμη in later Greek; but it makes the phrase less weighty as a threat and more strained in expression than (1) does. However, again, the

[1] See recently D. Ableitinger-Grünberger, *Der junge Horaz und die Politik* (Heidelberg, 1972), pp.72–4; N. Horsfall, *Prudentia* 8 (1976), 85–7; I. M. Le M. Du Quesnay, *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* (Liverpool, 1976), pp.75–81.

[2] See first Lycophron, *Alex.* 1233; another clear example in Augustan poetry is Prop. 4.10.17, where Romulus is called 'urbis (Ῥώμης) virtutisque (ῥώμης) parens'. In general, see Th. Birt, *De Romae urbis nomine sive de robore Romano* (Marburg, 1887), pp.5–11.

[3] As it clearly is at 8.143–5; 12.67; 13.81; 14.40.

[4] *La Troisième Sibylle* (Paris, 1970), p.309.

[5] For examples of this meaning in later Greek, see, besides LSJ, *Or. Sib.* Praef. p.4 1.87 Geffcken; Joseph., *Ant.* 7.239; G. Mayer, *Index Philoneus*, s.v.; Origen, *De orat.* 24.3.

[6] *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (Munich, 1951), p.89.