

NOTES ON VELLEIUS

Velleius' text rests on a single manuscript, found at Murbach in 1515, which long ago disappeared. We know of it from three reports: (a) the editio princeps (P) by its discoverer Rhenanus, published in 1520, apparently from an inaccurate copy taken by an anonymous friend;¹ (b) notes on the manuscript taken by Rhenanus' secretary Burer (B), who compared it with proofs of the edition; and (c) a copy (A), probably from the same source as P, taken in 1516 by B. Amerbach and discovered by Orelli in 1834. Of this text one editor has written: 'While modern scholarship has made progress in solving its enigmas, the text of Velleius, unless some long-hidden manuscript shall unexpectedly come to light, will always continue to be one of the most corrupt among the surviving texts of classical authors'.²

Such a text has naturally given rise to a vast number of conjectures, most of them valueless, though a few treasures lie unheeded among the rubbish.

I cite from C. Stegmann von Pritzwald's second Teubner edition of 1933, still waiting to be superseded.

1. 17. 7. praeteritoque eo, in quo eminere non possumus, aliquid, in quo *nitamur*, conquirimus

The meaning required is not 'make an effort' but 'excel', corresponding to *eminere*, as given by *eniteamus* (Heinsius). Better *niteamus*. *eniteo* (-esco) does not occur in this writer, who does use *niteo* metaphorically in 2. 9. 1 *eodem tractu temporum nituerunt oratores*.³

1. 18. 2 neque hoc ego magis miratus sim quam neminem Argivum Thebanum Lacedaemonium oratorem aut dum vixit auctoritate aut post mortem memoria dignum existimatum. quae urbes *et in alia* talium studiorum fuere steriles, nisi Thebas unum os Pindari illuminaret: nam Alcmæna Lacones falso sibi vindicant.

et in alia Sauppe: *et in Italia* (in Italia) MA: om. P: *eximiae alias* Faehse: *alia alii*. *in alia* does not consort easily with *talium studiorum*. For sense I much prefer Faehse's proposal; Velleius would naturally refer to the distinction of these cities in other areas. Perhaps add *vigentes* or the like after *urbes* (Stegmann compares 2. 13. 1 *meliore in omnia ingenio*), omitting *et*. *talium* covers the range of literary and artistic activities reviewed in 1. 16. 3–17. 4 and in the preceding sentence: *una urbs Attica pluribus annis eloquentia quam universa Graecia operibusque floruit*.

2. 2. 3 simul etiam promulgatis agrariis legibus, *omnibus statum* concupiscentibus, summa imis miscuit (sc. Ti. Gracchus)

statum P: *factum* A: *statum novum* Halm: *statum mutatum* Eitrem: *alii alia*. Accepting the former of these two conjectures (cf. 2. 125. 1 *novum statum*... *quaerebant*) we are left with the problem of *omnibus*. It was the have-nots, not the whole population, that wanted a new deal. Perhaps <*tenui*>*oribus*. *tenuis*, *tenuiores* in this

¹ See A. J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus, the Tiberian Narrative* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 5 ff.

² F. W. Shipley, ed. 1924 (Loeb), p. xix. This, by the way, does less than justice to some earlier scholars, especially Lipsius, whose critical intelligence far surpassed that of any modern editor.

³ The most recent editor, J. Hellegouarc'h (Budé, 1982), reads *nitamur* and translates 'où nous soyons capables de briller'. I shall take no further notice of this edition.

sense is common in Cicero (e.g. *Sest.* 107 *fortunae constitui tenuiorum videbantur*) and sporadic elsewhere.

2. 5. 3 hic virtute ac severitate facti, at Fabius Aemilianus *Pauli* exemplo disciplinae in Hispania fuit clarissimus.

disciplina Puteanus. But in his account of Paulus in 1. 9. 3–6 Velleius does not refer to his character as a disciplinarian; and he would tell his unlearned readers whose son Fabius was, not leave them to deduce it for themselves from the adoptival cognomen; cf. 2. 10. 2 *Fabio Pauli nepote*, 2. 39. 1 *Fabioque, nepote Pauli*. Lipsius took *Pauli* as *Pauli filii*, but Ruhnken observed that this ellipse seems not to occur with Roman names (cf. K.–S. i. 414, where Cic. *Cluent.* 94 *Fausto Sullae* ought not to have been cited) and rightly added *f.*

2. 7. 3 sed Opimium, virum alioqui sanctum et gravem, damnatum postea iudicio publico memoria ipsius saevitiae nulla civilis prosecuta est misericordia. eadem Rupilius Popiliusque, qui consules asperissime in Tiberii Gracchi amicos saevierant, postea iudiciorum publicorum merito oppressit invidia.

Krause (ed. 1800) explained *invidia* as hatred felt by juries friendly to Gracchus, which will not do. *eadem*, referring back to *nulla...misericordia*, must be understood of the disapproval felt by the community. Note Shipley's translation: 'deservedly met at a later date with the same mark of popular disapproval at their public trials'. Further, I doubt whether *invidia iudiciorum* (= *iudicum*) is a possible expression. *opera* might be supplied after *iudiciorum* or *publicorum*; cf. Liv. 29. 37. 4 *tribus quarum opera damnatus erat*. The public disapproved and their disapproval took effect through the instrumentality of the juries, which shared it. The fact that Velleius' statement about both of the two men is incorrect does not affect the reading.

2. 10. 2 VII ante hunc nobilissimae simplicitatis iuvenem, Cn. Domitium, fuere, singuli omnino parentibus geniti

singuli Lipsius: *-lis* AP. This is not to advocate *singuli* <*singuli*>s, already plausibly proposed and read by Krause, but to draw attention to Velleius' idiosyncratic use of *simplex* and *simplicitas*. In 2. 116. 4 *optimo civi, simplicissimo duci*, where the idea of artlessness or candour clearly has no place (cf. Shipley, 'an honest commander'!), I take the meaning to be 'all of one piece', i.e. 'perfect' ('a thorough general', 'a general through and through'). This suits *simplicitatis* above and other examples: 2. 43. 4 *viri in tantum boni in quantum humana simplicitas intellegi potest*, 2. 72. 3 *L. Domitii... eminentissimae ac nobilissimae simplicitatis viri*, 2. 125. 5 *vir simplicitatis generosis-simae*. In 2. 129. 1 *simplicique virtute merentis semper, numquam captantis gloriam* it makes little difference whether we render 'perfect' or 'unadulterated'.

2. 21. 4 cuius (sc. Cn. Pompeii Strabonis) interitus voluptas amissorum aut gladio aut morbo civium paene damno repensata est

'The joy...almost counterbalanced the feeling of loss' (Shipley). No doubt that is what Velleius is saying, but if the text is sound, he says it improperly. *pensare* and *repensare* are used of counterbalancing bad with good (2. 12. 5 *mala bonis repensasse*) or good with bad (2. 115. 5 *victoriae occasio, quam damno amissi pensaret militis*, 2. 88. 3 *praematura morte immortalem nominis sui pensavit memoriam*, where *pensare* effectively = 'pay for'). But something good (here pleasure at the death of an odious person) is not *almost* counterbalanced, or paid for, with something bad, when

the latter obviously weighs heavier than the former. It should be the other way round. *damnum repensavit* would satisfy sense without accounting for the tradition. *damnum repensa*<*re existima*>*ta est* does both (*damnū* changed to *damno* to restore syntax).

2. 31. 2 f. Aulus Gabinius tribunus legem tulit...quo scito paene totius terrarum orbis imperium uni viro deferebatur; sed tamen idem hoc ante *biennium* in M. *Antoni praetura* decretum erat. sed interdum persona ut exemplo nocet, ita invidiam auget aut levat.

quo scito Schegk: *quos C̄ A: quo senatus COS P.* Krause saw that *biennium* comes from *septennium*, i.e. II from VII. That *Antoni praetura* comes from *Antonio praetore* was seen by Boher and recognised by Madvig in his *Adversaria*.⁴ In the next sentence Lipsius, Heinsius, Orelli, Bernays, Madvig, and P. Thomas tried their hands at correcting *ut...levat*, but none of them achieved the requisite parallelism between the *ut* and *ita* clauses. In both Velleius is thinking of bad measures, though what he says also applies to good ones, *mutatis mutandis*. So I suggest <*magis aut minus*> *nocet* (cf. 2. 114. 3 *quatenus exemplo non nocebatur*). In this particular case the insignificance of M. Antonius as compared with Pompey made his extraordinary command at once less harmful as a precedent and less invidious.

2. 24. 1 C. Flavius Fimbria, qui...imperator appellatus forti Mithridatem pepulerat proelio, *sqq.*

forti Puteanus: *fonte AP.* *forti* has been supported with App. *Mithr.* 52 οὐκ ἀγεννῶς ἡγωνίσαστο and *fortis pugna* in Val. Max. 5. 3. 2 and Val. Fl. 4. 193. There remains an unobserved discrepancy with other accounts, according to which Fimbria defeated Mithridates' generals (Liv. *Epit.* 83, Plut. *Sull.* 23. 6) and/or his homonymous son (Memnon 24, App. *Mithr.* 52, Front. *Strat.* 3. 17. 5, Oros. 6. 2. 10), not the king himself. Velleius was capable of such a mistake, and a copyist would be no less capable of losing *f(ilium)* before *pepulerat*.

2. 25. 3 adeo enim Sulla dissimilis fuit bellator ac victor, ut dum vincit, †ac iustissimo† lenior, post victoriam audito fuerat crudelior.

mitissimo (Lipsius) will represent the sense, likewise *mansuetissimo* (Cornelissen) or *clementissimo* or *moderatissimo*. *iustus ac lenissimo* (Castiglioni) tries to make terms with the *ductus litterarum*, regardless of the irrelevance of *iustus* and the wreck of rhetorical balance. Perhaps <*pl*>*acatissimo*.

2. 27. 5 utcumque cecidit, hodieque tanta patris imagine non obscuratur *fili* memoria. de quo *iuvene* quid existimaverit Sulla, in promptu est.

fili Laurent (ante Dahlmann; vide Kritz): *ciuis* MA: *eius* P. *fili* is not likely to have been changed to *ciuis*. *eius* is rhetorically poor, so I think the answer may be *iuvenis*, with *iuvene* omitted as a gloss.

2. 28. 2 imperio, <quo> priores ad vindicandam maximis periculis rem publicam olim usi erant, eo <in> immodicae crudelitatis licentiam *usus* est

For the paradoxos, emended by Gelenius and Ruhnken, see editions. The inelegance of *usi erant...usus est* is easily removed: read *abusus est*, comparing Val. Max. 7. 3. 5 *non solum eloquentia sua uti, sed etiam verecundia abuti erat paratus*, Sidon. *Epist.* 3. 14. 2 *sic non utitur litteris quod abutitur* (on which see *Phoenix* 36 [1982], 347).

⁴ 'Certissima emendatio', as A. Barndt called it (*Quaestiones criticae Velleianae*, Diss. Freiburg, 1873, p. 13). Modern editions ignore it.

2. 28. 3 primus...exemplum proscriptionis invenit, ut in qua civitate petulantis convicii iudicium *histrioni ex albo* redditur, in ea iugulati civis Romani publice constitueretur auctoramentum.

histrioni (Gelenius) *ex albo* Mommsen: *historiarum* (-arium P) *ex alto* MAP: *histrioni iniuriarum* (*iniu-* iam Pithoeus) vel *histrioni extraordinarium* Ellis. My copy of Ellis' edition, once the property of W. B. Anderson, has a pencilled note: 'iniuriarum et ultio (*s. et multa?*) W. B. A.'.

2. 29. 5 hic a toga virili adsuetus commilitio prudentissimi ducis, parentis sui, bonum et capax recta discendi ingenium singulari rerum militarium prudentia excoluerat, ut a Sertorio Metellus laudaretur magis, Pompeius timeretur validius * *

The lacuna was diagnosed by Krause, who thought the missing text contained an account of the Sertorian war. Doubtless it did, but it will also have reviewed Pompey's earlier career including his first Triumph, as shown by 2. 30. 2 *hoc quoque triumpho* (sc. *ex Hispania*) *adhuc eques Romanus...invectus est*. Moreover, *ut...validius* is not an introduction to a narrative of the Sertorian war but a conclusion. The lacuna comes after *excoluerat*.

2. 30. 4 hoc consulatu Pompeius tribuniciam potestatem restituit, cuius Sulla imaginem *sine re* reliquerat.

sine re Gelenius: *in iure* AP. Pencilled note by Anderson: 'non iura W. B. A.'.

2. 30. 6 huius patrati gloria penes M. Crassum fuit, mox *rei publicae* omnium principem.

omnium P: *omni* A. The proposals in Stegmann's apparatus may as well be left there. They do not include Lipsius' *mox opibus principem*, which seized the essential point: cf. Plin. *HN* 33. 134 *Quiritium post Sullam ditissimus. r(ei) p(ublicae)* may be the remains of *op*. So perhaps: *mox op<ibus> omnium principem*. Velleius uses *opes* for wealth (2. 18. 5, 2. 28. 4, 2. 48. 4), not *divitiae*.

2. 32. 3 per idem tempus Cotta iudicandi munus...in utrumque ordinem partitus est.

The praenomen (*L.*) is called for, particularly as there were three contemporary Cottae. Its absence in 2. 43. 1 *absens pontifex factus est in Cottae consularis locum* is compensated by *consularis*.

2. 35. 3 tanta vi animi atque ingenii invectus est in coniurationem, eo ardore *oris* orationem omnium lenitatem suadentium societate consilii suspectam fecit...ut universus senatus in eius sententiam transiret

eo Lipsius: *et* AP. Bothe thought *et ardore...fecit* spurious, but that is going too far. *os* = *oratio* is, of course, common, and often accompanied by an epithet such as *animosus* or *blandus*. But *oris* is superfluous here and awkward before a noun of the same meaning. Also it invites an unhappy misunderstanding; the reader may be tempted to think of Cato's red face. I would read <*dol*>*oris* ('indignation'), comparing Virg. *Aen.* 9. 66 *ignescunt irae; duris dolor ossibus ardet*.

2. 36. 2 neque ullo in suscepto carminis sui opere minorem Catullum.

in suspecti operis sui carmine AP. This unsatisfactory text is Halm's (ed. 1876), the same Halm who in Orelli's edition of 1835 had produced the one correction out of

many to express exactly what Velleius surely meant (it was repeated by Cobet in *Mnemos.* 9 [1881], 28 and by P. Thomas *ibid.* 49 [1921], 19): *in suscepti* (Lipsius) *operis sui genere*; cf. *Thes.* vi. 1900. 32. The expression is analogous to *perfectissimi in forma operis sui* below; cf. Tac. *Dial.* 18. 3 *formas et genera dicendi* ('durchaus synonym gebraucht' Gudeman). Heinsius, Ruhnken, and Thomas wished to omit *sui*, but cf. K.–S. i. 597.

2. 39. 1 quippe eius ductu auspiciisque infractae (sc. Galliae) paene idem, quod totus terrarum orbis, *in aerarium* conferunt stipendium.

in aerarium Aldus: *ignauum* AP. If this correction is right, the corruption must be attributed to an obliteration or obscurity in a parent manuscript; for nothing could be less apt to tempt a copyist into error than this reading (cf. 2. 39. 2, 2. 40. 3). It would be pleasing to take *ignavum* ('silly!' or 'careless!') as the comment of an attentive reader on Velleius' statement, which fully deserves it when set beside his ensuing statement about Egypt: *Divus Augustus...paene idem facta Aegypto stipendiaria quantum pater eius Galliis in aerarium reditus contulit*. If Gaul contributed almost as much as the rest of the world (including Egypt), Egypt could not contribute almost as much as Gaul.

For *ignavus* 'fere i.q. stultus, ignarus *sim.*', *Thes.* cites only Commodian and Victor Vitensis, but refers to Lucil. 537 *cur tam ignaviter...quaeris?* ('spec. fere i.q. parum apte, stulte'). Of literary style sometimes (*Thes.* vii. 2. 279. 61): in Hor. *Epist.* 2. 1. 67 *ignave* (*dicere*) corresponds to ἀργῶς, "'inactively, inertly, sluggishly'" (Brink), but this merges easily into the idea of slovenliness or carelessness, as in Gell. 13. 25. 20 *significationis eiusdem repetitio ignava et fugienda videri (non) debet*,

2. 47. 2 quarto ferme anno Caesar morabatur in Galliis, cum medium iam ex invidia *potentiae male* cohaerentis inter Cn. Pompeium et C. Caesarem concordiae pignus Iulia, uxor Magni, decessit.

potentiae male Lipsius: *Ponti et (ac P) Camiliae* AP: *potentiae cum illa aegre* Ellis. Palaeographically it would be about as easy to write *po<te>ntiae mutua* (*pontiē(u)tca*) *male*. *mutua* makes for a clearer focus. Cf. Shipley: 'because of each one's jealousy of the other's power', also Luc. 1. 98 *temporis angusti mansit concordia discors*.

2. 49. 1 f. alterius ducis causa melior videbatur, alterius erat firmior: hic omnia speciosa, illic valentia: Pompeium senatus auctoritas, Caesarem militum armavit fiducia. consules senatusque causae, non Pompeio summam imperii detulerunt. nihil relictum a Caesare, quod servandae pacis causa temptari posset, nihil receptum a Pompeianis.

causae <defensori> Pompeio P. Thomas (*Mnemos.* 49 [1921], 20), quoting Lipsius: 'Ego vero haec non capio. Quid est *causae deferre summam imperii*? Illa igitur imperavit? exercitus duxit, instruxit? Nugae!' *vindici* seems preferable to *defensori* (ἀπ. λεγ. in Velleius); cf. 2. 75. 3 *vindicem Romani imperii* (*sim.* 2. 104. 2). But perhaps Velleius thought he had found a clever way of saying that command was vested in Pompey as representing the cause, not to use for any personal ends. What is certain is that a balancing clause, e.g. *Caesar sibi bellavit*, has fallen out after *detulerunt*.

2. 59. 1 Caesaris deinde testamentum apertum est, quo C. Octavium, nepotem sororis suae Iuliae, adoptabat. de cuius origine, *etiamsi praenitet*, pauca dicenda sunt.

praenitet Heinsius: *praevenit et* AP: *properanti* Acidalius: *per se nitet* Burman: *praevenit* Ellis. In this *locus vexatissimus* (Krause) only Acidalius saw aright. Velleius is constantly emphasizing his haste. e.g. 2. 55. 1 *admonet promissae brevitatis fides quanto omnia transcurso dicenda sint*. Turning aside from his narrative, he naturally apologizes. But *etiamsi* with participle = *quamvis* seems to be unexampled and *properanti* is unlikely to have become *praevenit et*. Perhaps *etiam sic properare volenti* (*p(pe)ra(r)e uolenti*); cf. *uoluerant/uenerant* at 2. 50. 1.

2. 60. 1 non placebat Atiae matri Philippoque vitrico adiri nomen *invidiosae* fortunae *Caesaris*

For this nonsense read *nomen invidiosum Fortunae*, 'a name to make Fortune jealous'. Cf. Calp. Flacc. 42 *cum subito Fortuna, sicut solet, ipsa suis muneribus invidit*, Apul. *Apol.* 21 *quia mihi Fortuna divitias invidit*, and, for the dative, Plin. *HN* 35. 11 *inventor muneris etiam dis invidiosi*, Ov. *Met.* 6. 276 *invidiosa suis* (Niobe). *invidiosum* is attributed to Scrin(er)ius, and doubtless comes from his Groningen dissertation of 1879 (*Quaestiones Velleianae*), a work which I have not seen. *Caesaris* appears to be a gloss (on glosses in Velleius see L. C. Purser, *Hermath.* 10 [1897], 380).

2. 90. 1 sepultis, ut praediximus, bellis civilibus coalescentibusque rei publicae membris, *etiam coaluere* quae tam longa armorum series laceraverat.

etiam coaluere (*et c-* iam Bergk) Ellis: *et coram aliero* AP. 'I believe the strange corruption, *et coram aliero*, to have arisen from *etiam coluerunt* rather than from *et coluere*, as Bergk, the author of this very fine emendation, thought. *etiam coaluerunt* became *iam et co aluerunt*, and this *et coram aliero*' (Ellis, *Hermath.* 10 [1897], 17). It is not always understood that *longa armorum series* has no reference to the civil wars. What follows shows that it means the wars waged by Rome against peoples long resistant to Roman rule, in Dalmatia, in the Alps, and in Spain. Read <ea> *etiam coaluere quae iam longa*.

2. 100. 3 quippe filia eius Iulia, per omnia tanti parentis ac viri immemor, nihil, quod facere aut pati turpiter posset femina, *luxuria* libidine infectum reliquit

luxuria ac libidine Orelli: *lu- libidineve* Halm (-*neque* Cludius): *furiosa libidine* P. Thomas. Perhaps *luxuriae libidine* (cf. *Thes.* vii. 2. 1336. 41 *sqq.*).

2. 109. 2 gentibus hominibusque a nobis descendentibus erat apud eum (*sc.* Maroboduum) perfugium, *totumque* ex male dissimulato agebat aemulum.

The imbecile *totumque* is not much improved by *in totumque* (Acidalius), *totusque* (Heinsius), or *totum denique* (Haase). Read *apertumque* (*aptumque*). *ex* is as in Cic. *Vat.* 29 *ex pauperrimo dives* et sim. (*Thes.* v. 2. 1100. 23).

2. 110. 5 in omnibus autem Pannoniis non disciplinae tantummodo, sed linguae quoque notitia Romanae, plerisque etiam litterarum usus et familiaris *animorum* erat exercitatio.

Woodman's lengthy note begins: 'A most peculiar statement, of whose precise significance I am not sure'. The rest of it shows at any rate that the problem of *animorum* has not been solved. That, as often, is because the right question has not been asked. All the Pannonians knew some Latin, many well enough to read the literature and – what? If your knowledge of a foreign language goes beyond the elementary stage, what do you do besides read it? You talk in it. Read *sermonum*,

noting that the previous word ends in *s* and that *nimorum* is practically an anagram of *ermonum*.

2. 117. 2 Varus Quintilius, *inlustri* magis quam *nobili* ortus familia

The ill-fated Proconsul's family was patrician, therefore of the cream of Roman nobility; but like the Pinarii, the Quinctilii under the Republic had kept a very low profile, with only one Consulate, in 453, and a Military Tribunate *consulari potestate* in 403. But at any rate in the last two centuries of the Republic they continued to hold lesser offices and presumably priesthoods (a Flamen Martialis is recorded), without producing a single individual of note. This text astonished Ursinus, as well it might, and Ruhnken made the obvious transposition. All that Woodman finds to remark about the two adjectives is that they are apt to occur in combination. Then too their meaning is quite distinct. A man or a family might be both noble and famous, or might be one but not the other. The contrast here is pretty much the same as between *clarus* and *vetustus* in Tac. *Ann.* 4. 61. 1, of Asinius Agrippa, *claris maioribus quam vetustis*. Modern editors are presumably content with Orelli's assurance that the family is called *illustris* because it was patrician and would have been *nobilis* if many of its members had held offices ('honores'), which was not the case. This is effrontery. Admittedly *nobilis* can = *clarus* in other contexts, as in 1. 1. 4 *et loco et incolis et mari nobile ac perpetuum a se nomen dedit*, but where is it used of families in any other sense than 'noble', and at that in contrast with a word like *illustris*? The only other Velleian example of this latter word is in 1. 4. 4, where as usual it means 'famous' (*non minus illustres obtinuerunt locos clarasque urbis condiderunt*⁵). What warrant is there for the assumption that Velleius could stand these two words of well-defined function on their heads? As an alternative to the transposition we might read *minus illustri* for *illustri magis*, supposing that *minus* fell out and was then replaced by *magis*, as would have been almost bound to happen.⁶

2. 122. 1 f. quis enim dubitare potest quin . . . et post cladem sub Varo acceptam, *ocius* prosperrimo rerum eventu eadem excisa Germania triumphus summi ducis adornari debuerit?

ocys P: *totius* MA: *expectato ocus* Halm: *voto o-* Burman. I suggest *optato ocus*. I do not understand Suetonius (*Tib.* 18 f.) to say 'that the campaign was deliberately slow' (Woodman).

2. 128. 2 et qui equestri loco natum Sp. Carvilius et mox M. Catonem, novum etiam *Tusculo* urbis inquilinum . . . in consulatus, censuras et triumphos provexere

The sense, as seen by Ellis, who put a comma after *Tusculo*, is that Cato was a 'new man' even in his home town, whereas in Rome he was not only 'new' but a mere settler from outside. Hence *in Tusculo* (Purser). But in classical usage, including that of Velleius, 'at Tusculum' is *Tusculi* (cf. K.-S. i. 477 f.).⁷

Harvard University

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY

⁵ What *familia illustris* meant to Cicero is well illustrated by *Mur.* 17 *ex familia vetere et illustri*. The Licinii Murenæ were an old family because they had a history of curule offices below the Consulate and an illustrious one because of the father of Cicero's client, the Triumphator.

⁶ There is a similar choice to make in Suet. *Claud.* 10. 2: see *CJ* 78 (1983), 317n.

⁷ As often in the past, I have to thank my colleague Professor Badian for his acute and helpful criticisms.