

turned up a pleasant surprise. In the *apparatus* of Clausen's *editio maior*<sup>3</sup> there is the entry

scutica et VΦ, scyticte et P, scutitet α.

Since my emendation is supported by the reading of the most important manuscript,<sup>4</sup> which is alone in preserving the truth in four other places in this very satire,<sup>5</sup> it is at least worthy of serious consideration in constituting the text of Persius.

University of Delaware

J. D. MORGAN

<sup>3</sup> W. V. Clausen [ed.], *A. Persi Flacci Saturarum Liber* (Oxford, 1956), *ad loc.*

<sup>4</sup> From a microfilm of P, kindly furnished by the Bibliothèque interuniversitaire de Montpellier, Section médecine, I have verified that its reading is indeed 'scyticte & metus egit erilis'. One possibility is that in an ancestor of P which read 'scuticae metus egit erilis' the '&' was entered as a variant; another is that P's 'scyticte' is the result of the correction of one of its ancestors against a codex which read 'scuticae metus egit erilis'.

<sup>5</sup> In verses 87, 105, 112, and 190, as observed by Clausen on p. xvi of his *editio maior*.

## NOTES ON QUINTILIAN AND [QUINTILIAN]<sup>1</sup>

### (i) Quint. 11.3.59

Sed quodcumque ex his vitium magis tulerim quam, quo nunc maxime laboratur in causis omnibus scholisque, cantandi... (57)... Nam Cicero illos ex Lycia et Caria rhetoras paene cantare in epilogis dixit: nos etiam cantandi severiorem paulo modum excessimus (58). Quisquamne, non dico de homicidio sacrilegio parricidio, sed de calculis certe atque rationibus, quisquam denique, ut semel finiam, in lite cantat?

The answer to the basic question, *quisquamne cantat?*, given the rhetoric of the context (perhaps a professorial chestnut of Quintilian's: elements from 11.3.60 turn up at Pliny, *Ep.* 2.14.3), especially emotive in 57, should be that everyone *cantat*, but the form of the question seems to suggest, at first sight, the opposite.

It might be possible to treat it as a loose way of saying, 'Does anyone in his right mind sing...?'. But (a) the crucial idea of propriety is unexpressed; (b) *ut semel finiam*, together with *denique* and the repetition of *quisquam*, indicates a rhetorical culmination: if *cantandum* is less absurd in emotive levels (cf. 58), it follows that the *non dico* here ought to make an exception of *homicidium*, *sacrilegium* and *parridium*, which leaves only *calculis* and *rationibus* to culminate in *in lite*. This is weak in itself, but also (c) demands that *lis* should represent a very trivial business whereas semantically it should include *homicidium* and the rest (cf. Cic. *pro Cluent.* 116, *maiestatis* and *capitis*).

The three difficulties may be removed, and *non dico...sed...* given a more normal (non-excluding) usage<sup>2</sup> by reading:

...in lite <non><sup>3</sup> cantat?

'Does anyone, not just in (less inappropriate) serious cases, but actually in trivial ones, does anyone, to sum it all up, in any action *not* sing?'

### (ii) Decl. Min. 274.4

Non satis putaverunt maiores eas poenas adversus tyrannum constituere quas possit excipere in

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Dr M. Winterbottom for his comments on these passages.

<sup>2</sup> See 10.1.48; 10.7.2; 1.10.35 for Quintilianic exx. Cf. also Pliny, *Ep.* 2.4.2; 7.17.9; 8.6.2; Sen. *NQ* 1 *pr.* 7 (*non tantum dico...sed...*); contrast Pliny, *Ep.* 7.9.9; 9.14.1 where the *non dico* excludes, but where this is also made explicit in the context.

<sup>3</sup> Emphasis and rhythm justify this position for the insertion.

vita. *Multos* magis tangit sepultura; ad cogitationem post se futurorum plerique gravior moventur.

*Multos* is impossibly weak as an answer to *non satis ... in vita*; the escalated version in *plerique* makes this more patent (and the weakness of *multos* itself vitiates the force of *plerique*).

Read *multo magis*, producing an even crescendo, with the object of *tangit* supplied from the drift of *non satis ... in vita*.<sup>4</sup>

### (iii) *Decl. Min.* 291.6

adulteros tu dices iacentes in geniali toro? Duri mehercule viderentur si cito oblivisci coniugii potuissent.

*Duri ... si oblivisci coniugii potuissent* would make a suggestive and potent point. The qualification *cito* restricts and weakens it. (It would also allow the opposition to argue that enough time had elapsed to allow the adulterers decently to forget their earlier marriage.)

*Cito* is not an interpolation. But *tam* could easily have fallen out: it would tie the *sententia* to the relevant moment (the time of the adultery) and stress the recentness of the earlier marriage, a strong justification for the defence. Read, then, *si <tam> cito oblivisci ... potuissent*.

Chatham

F. JONES

<sup>4</sup> The anonymous referee suggests that one might also consider *nullos* (sc. *quam tyrannos*).

### CIRCA OR CITRA? ON SUETONIUS, *NERO* 15.2

defunctoque circa Kal. Ian. altero e consulibus neminem substituit (sc. Nero) improbens exemplum vetus Canini Rebili uno die consulis. (Nero 15.2)

Recently in this journal, R. Shaw-Smith suggested reading '*citra Kal. Ian.*': '*circa*, implying that the consul died either before or after 1st January, will not do.'<sup>1</sup> Will the example of *citra* at Aug. 43.4, adduced by Shaw-Smith (and the OLD [s.v. '*citra*' 3]) in support of the meaning '(shortly) before'?

Elsewhere, Suetonius uses *citra* only in the sense of *praeter* or *sine*, 'without', 'without regard to': *DJ* 28.1, '*citra senatus populi auctoritatem*'; *Aug.* 24.2, '*citra commoda emeritorum praemiorum*'; 66.4, '*citra honorem verborum*'; *Claud.* 35.2, '*citra bellum posse terreri*'. This usage is common in Silver Latin,<sup>2</sup> and the context of *Aug.* 43.4 does not suggest a more restrictive meaning there, such as '(shortly) before the days of the *spectacula*'. The passage – the only instance of *citra* in what may be called a temporal sense in Suetonius – bears quoting in full: '*solebat etiam citra spectaculorum dies, si quando quid invisitatum dignumque cognitu advectum esset, id extra ordinem quolibet loco publicare, ut rhinocerotem apud Saepta, tigrim in scaena, anguem quinquaginta cubitorum pro comitio.*' This follows a description of exhibits during various *spectacula*, including the parading of Parthian hostages 'quodam muneris die' (*Aug.* 43.3), which context, together with the indefinite 'si quando quid' and the phrase '*extra ordinem*' makes it plain that *citra* at 43.4 stands

<sup>1</sup> *CQ* 37 (1987), 535.

<sup>2</sup> See W. Baumgarten-Crusius, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli opera*, iii (Torino, 1826), p. 110; E. S. Shuckburgh, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Augustus* (Cambridge, 1896), p. 53; and the OLD s.v. '*citra*' 4–7.