

other passages the possessive is useful in the context. Here it would not be – for Ovid is not emphasizing his responsibility for the *error*, but that it was an *error* and nothing worse.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

W. A. CAMPS

THREE CICERONIANA

(1) *Att.* 15.26.5

Mundus istum M. En(n)ius in the manuscripts of *Att.* 15.26.5 is surely corrupt, as has been unanimously acknowledged (above all Cicero would avoid giving the three parts of a name in the order cognomen + praenomen + nomen, not to speak of the inexplicable *istum*). Also the modern Vulgate *Mundus iste cum M. Ennio*, introduced by Wesenberg in his Teubner text, is an improbable guess. Shackleton Bailey has recently proposed *Maenius* or *Men(n)ius* as the gentile name of Mundus.¹ *Mennius*, however, is a very rare name and does not occur in Republican documents, while *Maenius*, although attested in Republican inscriptions, diverges unnecessarily from the manuscript tradition. Moreover, Shackleton Bailey must forcibly change *istum* to *iste* (even if he does not say so expressly). But it is possible to avoid practically any infringement of the transmitted text if we simply read *Mundus Istummenius*. The name (*H*) *istumen(n)ius*, (*H*) *istimen(n)ius* (also *Inst-*), written in a wide variety of ways, does occur some 20 times in urban inscriptions, mostly of the early Imperial period. It is attested also outside Rome: at Velitrae (*CIL* X 6556, of the early Imperial period), and even as far away as Gallia (*CIL* XIII 739, Bordeaux, early Empire).² This gens must therefore have been somehow present among the Roman population of the Julio-Claudian age. In particular, attention should be paid to an *Instumennius* on a tessera nummularia of 60 B.C. (*CIL* I² 915). No major figures occur in this gens, the name remaining restricted to the lower strata of the Roman population. That suits Mundus down to the ground. He clearly belongs to the grey mob of Rome. If he is, as it seems, identical with that Mundus mentioned in 15.29.1,³ then Cicero gives his family name in the first instance. The transmitted form with *-mm-* could represent a transposition of the double consonant of the common form *Istumennius*.

(2) *Har. resp.* 1

P. Tullioni Syro, as transmitted in the manuscripts, has also become the modern Vulgate, repeated confidently in all editions. That is an impossible name-form, for a gentile name *Tullio* would be a monster, and the cognomen *Tullio* (in itself a good Latin formation)⁴ can be ruled out, for Cicero does not call people outside the nobility by their praenomen + cognomen. The fragility of the transmitted text has been noted only by Shackleton Bailey,⁵ but his own improvement *Pantoleoni* is odd. It deviates quite markedly from the manuscript tradition (I really cannot understand how *Pantoleon(t)i* could have become *P. Tullioni*). Moreover, the name *Pantoleon* (*Παντο-*

¹ D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature* (*American Classical Studies* 3, New York, 1976), 36; see also his edition of the *Letters to Atticus*, *ad. loc.*

² 'M. Histimenius Treptus Histimeniae fil(iae) . . . Histimeniae Rufinae uxori.' The family may be of Roman origin. Some other attestations: *AE* 1980, 386 (Histimennius, Interamnia), 1981, 479 (Istumennius, Sardinia).

³ *Mundus* is by no means improbable as a Republican cognomen, even if attested only rarely.

⁴ '*Tullio* is an odd cognomen even for a Roman', says Shackleton Bailey (see the following note). This is not, in fact, true. Cognomina formed with *-io* from gentilicia or praenomina (like *Tullus*) are not uncommon; see Kajanto, *Latin Cognomina*, 163–5, where many items could be added.

⁵ *Two Studies*, 70.

λέων) is virtually non-existent,⁶ the normal Greek form being Πανταλέων. The latter is not very common in the Greek world either, and unknown in Roman onomastics.⁷ *P. Tullio Nisyro* would be better. It is true that *Nisyros* occurs nowhere else as a personal name, but names of islands were often transferred to persons in the Hellenistic world as well as in Rome. This holds true also for minor Greek islands.⁸ And note a Νισυροκλῆς at Telos (Peek, *Inscriptionen von dorischen Inseln* 44). The copyist, who was familiar with the name and the ethnicon *Syros* in Cicero's production, has removed the name *Nisyros*, which would have been totally unknown to him, by wrong word division. This man could have been any one of Clodius' adherents; there is no need to see him as a Syrian, as is occasionally done.⁹ If one insists on making him a Syrian, then it is necessary to read *Ptolliōni Syro* (would the first corrector of P have his *tollioni* from a lost source with *Ptolliōni*?). But the Egyptian formation Πτολλίαν does not occur outside Egypt (although a similar name Πτόλλις occurs here and there in the Hellenistic world). One can thus opt for a *P. Tullius Nisyros*. *Publius* among the *Tullii* is not unknown, and Cicero might have expressly added it to make a clear distinction with his own praenomen.

(3) *Fam.* 10.33.4

Fam. 10.33.4 mentions a commander of a Roman legion, whose name is given in most of the manuscripts as *pupilli Bagienni* (*pupili* V). Ever since Manutius, most editors have changed *pupil(I)i* to *P.* (cf. 13.11.1 where the same *pupillus* clearly represents the praenomen *Publius*). But how are we to explain *P. Bagienni*? Shackleton Bailey is inclined to see in *Bagiennus* a cognomen,¹⁰ but it would be a little unusual if the forename *Publius* were to be followed, not by the gentilicium, but only by the highly peculiar cognomen *Bagiennus* with its strong ethnic flavour. Moreover, a cognomen *Bagiennus* is not attested elsewhere; *Bagienni* in *CIL* III 13481 from Pannonia, to which Shackleton Bailey himself refers, represents the gentilicium *Bagienn(i)us*, which is also not otherwise attested. To take *Bagienni* here as a gentilicium would in itself be possible, but raises the question how the commander of a Roman legion might bear such a peculiar ethnic gentile name. However, *Bagiennus* might after all be a cognomen, though not a proper ethnic one, but a name accorded in virtue of the man's service in Liguria. Here I follow a proposal of Gardthausen followed by Shackleton Bailey.¹¹ This, in fact, would explain how the man could command a Roman

⁶ As far as I know, this name occurs only once: *IG* IX 2, 538 (Larisa, A.D. 117, freedman). *MAMA* III 167 and 635 are Christian and very late, and represent only a careless way of writing the name of St Pantaleon. And the name of a ruler at Cyrene, transmitted by Arist. fr. 611.21, p. 376 Rose in the form Παντολέων, may be a careless writing of Πανταλέων, the latter name being common in Cyrenian onomastics (according to an unpublished work by A. Laronde, *Prosopographie cyrénienne*, communicated to me by Olivier Masson). Similarly the author of an early cookery book (fifth century), whose name is given in Pollux 6.70 in the form Παντολέων, may in reality be a Pantaleon, if he is identical with that Pantaleon mentioned as the title bearer of a play by Theopompus, Meineke II 869 = Kock I 145 (cf. Schmid-Stählin I 4 [1946], 164).

⁷ *Pantaleon* as the name of two notarii of the Roman Church in the sixth century (Greg. M. *epist.* passim) derives from the saint. The same judgement applies to the name of a presbyter in Constantinople (Mansi VIII 1055B) and that of a bishop of Iuliopolis in Galatia (Mansi VIII 974D).

⁸ See the lists in Bechtel, *HPN*, 550ff. and in Solin, *Griech. Personennamen in Rom*, 566ff.

⁹ As e.g. Shackleton Bailey does. J. O. Lenaghan, *A Commentary on Cicero's Oration De haruspicum responsis* (The Hague, 1969), 49 is indecisive on this point.

¹⁰ *Two Studies*, 17; cf. also his commentary, *ad loc.*

¹¹ V. Gardthausen, *Philologus* 51 (1892), 518. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies*, 17 and his commentary *ad loc.* Tyrrell-Purser, vol. VI, 2nd edn. (1933), 250 is confused on this point.

legion – evidently he must have been a senator.¹² But if *Bagiennus* is a cognomen, then before it we have to find his gentile name, for it is inconceivable that Cicero would have mentioned him only by his praenomen and the very peculiar cognomen accorded him in a later stage of his career. Therefore I suspect that the *pupilli* of the manuscripts could conceal the name *Popillius*. Unfortunately, no connection with the known *Popillii* can be established.¹³

University of Helsinki

HEIKKI SOLIN

¹² Now listed in the Supplement of Broughton's *MRR* (Atlanta, 1986), 33.

¹³ After I made this conjecture, I noticed that it had already been proposed by V. Gardthausen, *Philologus* 51 (1892), 518. He failed, however, to explain fully the name form. At any rate, his conjecture deserves to be rescued from oblivion. Strangely enough, it has been banished from the critical apparatuses of most modern editions.

HORACE, *EPODE* 6.16

cave, cave; namque in malos asperimus
parata tollo cornua,
qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener
aut acer hostis Bupalō.
an, si quis atra dente me petiverit,
inultus ut flebo puer?

15

Horace, *Epod.* 6.11–16

Here Horace gives warning to an adversary of his powers of literary attack, comparing himself with the great iambists Archilochus ('Lycambae spretus infido gener') and Hipponax ('acer hostis Bupalō'). The general sense of the last two lines seems clear: 'If someone attacks me (gifted as I am with the weapons of the iambist), shall I weep like a mere boy?', i.e. 'Am I not to take revenge?'

'Inultus' in line 16 is incoherent with this sequence of thought, for the comparison needed at this point is not with someone who is 'inultus', 'unavenged', but rather with someone who is defenceless or powerless, unlike the formidable Horace. Commentators have recognized this problem, and respond to it by translating 'inultus' not 'unavenged' but 'without taking revenge', construing it with Horace as the subject of 'flebo' and not with 'puer'. This use of 'inultus' is wholly unparalleled; the adjective is elsewhere always used passively of persons or objects unavenged and never in the active sense of 'unavenging'.

Latinity and the sequence of thought are both restored by reading 'inutilis' for 'inultus ut'. 'Inutilis', going with 'puer', would be highly appropriate for a weak and vulnerable boy in this context of anticipated battle (note the military 'petiverit'), for it can have a quasi-technical sense of 'unfit for fighting' (cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 10.794 (the wounded Mezentius) 'inutilis inque ligatus'; Juvenal 15.126, 'imbelle et inutile vulgus'; *OLD* s.v., 1), following a similar use of ἀχρεῖος (Herodotus 3.81.1; Thucydides 2.6.4; *LSJ* s.v., 2). The omission of 'ut' in the comparison is a favourite colloquial device of Horace, admittedly not found elsewhere in the *Epodes* but frequent in just this type of phrase (with the noun taking the full weight of the comparison) in the *Epistles*: cf. 1.2.41–2, 'qui recte vivendi prorogat horam, / rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis'; 1.7.73–4, 'hinc ubi saepe / occultum visus decurrere piscis ad hamum'; 1.10.5–6, 'vetuli notique columbi / tu nidum servas, ego...'; 2.2.28–9, 'post hoc vehemens lupus, et sibi et hosti / iratus pariter'; 2.2.97–8, 'caedimur et totidem plagis consumimus hostem / lento Samnites ad lumina prima duello'; E. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960), 47–8. The corruption of 'inutilis' to