

of Bion's century (and after), but is very rare in Greek literature, with the exception of the *Anacreontea*, where this kind of *recusatio* stereotyped a theme by Anacreon and became an obsessive topos of the 'anacreontic' poetic ideology.⁸ As a matter of fact the closest parallel passage I know for Bion 9.8–11 (the poet's tongue cannot sing other gods and men, that is to say epic-encomiastic and mythological poetry, since it can sing only Eros and the poet's beloved⁹)

ἦν μὲν γὰρ βροτὸν ἄλλον ἢ ἀθανάτων τινὰ μέλπω,
βαμβαίνει μοι γλώσσα καὶ ὥς πάρος οὐκετ' αἰεῖδει·
ἦν δ' αὖτ' ἐς τὸν Ἔρωτα καὶ ἐς Λυκίδα·ν τι μελίσδω,
καὶ τόκα μοι χαίροισα διὰ στόματος ῥέει αὐδά.

is to be found in *An.* 23, a poem commonly included in the oldest nucleus of the *Anacreontea* (the poet's instruments can play nothing but love):

θέλω λέγειν Ἀτρείδας,
θέλω δὲ Κάδμον ᾄδειν,
ὁ βάρβιτος δὲ χορδαῖς
ἔρωτα μόνον ἤχει...
καὶ γὰρ μὲν ἦδον ἄθλους
Ἡρακλέους· λύρη δὲ
ἔρωτας ἀντεφώνει.

Università di Firenze

MARCO FANTUZZI

⁸ Cf. the excellent analyses by P. A. Rosenmeyer, *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 96–101.

⁹ This text seems to have been overlooked both as a forerunner of the poetics and the poetical-existential credo of Latin elegy (cf., however, Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.6, p. 81), and as a parallel for the *recusationes* in the *Anacreontea*. For instance even the very rich similia-apparatus provided by West in his Teubner edition of the *Anacreontea* (quoted above, n. 1), pp. 18–19, quotes only passages from Ovid's *Amores* with regard to *An.* 23.

SENATE INTERVENANTS IN 50 B.C.

M. Bonnefond-Coudry has performed a great service by compiling a list of senators who are known to have spoken in the senate ('intervenants') in the first century B.C. Yet her list for the year 50 invites a thoroughgoing revision. Beside the rubric '*supplicatio* à Cicéron' she gives the following list: Cato, Hirrus, Balbus, Lentulus (Spinther?), Domitius (Ahenobarbus or Calvinus), Scipio, Favonius. She also notes that Pompey spoke at a session late in the year (App. *B.C.* 2.28–9, instead of her reference, 2.29–30), and maintains that Scipio spoke on 1 December (Plut. *Caes.* 30.4–6).¹

The debate on Cicero's *supplicatio* is reported to us by Caelius (ap. Cic. *Fam.* 8.11.1–2):

renuntiatio nobis erat Hirrum diutius dicturum. prendimus eum; non modo non fecit sed, cum de hosti<i>s</i> ageretur et posset rem impedire si ut numeraretur postularet, tacuit. tantum Catoni adsensus est, qui <de> te locutus honorifice non decrerat supplicationes. tertius ad hos Favonius accessit. qua re pro cuiusque natura et instituto gratiae sunt agenda, his quod tantum voluntatem ostenderunt pro sententia, cum impedire possent non pugnarunt. Curioni vero quod de suarum actionum cursu tua causa deflexit. nam Furnius et Lentulus, ut debuerunt, quasi eorum res esset una nobiscum circumierunt et laborarunt. Balbi quoque Corneli operam et sedulitatem laudare possum; nam cum Curione vehementer locutus est et eum, si aliter fecisset,

¹ *Le Sénat de la République romaine de la guerre d'Hannibal à Auguste* (Rome, 1989), p. 628.

iniuriam Caesari facturum, dixit, tum eius fidem in suspicionem adduxit. decrerant quidem [qui] neque transigi volebant Domitii, Scipiones. quibus hac re ad intercessionem evocandam interpellantibus venustissime Curio respondit se eo libentius non intercedere quod quosdam qui decernerent videret confici nolle.²

1. Objection may be made to Bonnefond-Coudry's parenthetical note to Favonius, 'silencieux'. After naming Cato and Hirrus, Caelius writes: 'tertius ad hos Favonius accessit.' Strictly we do not know whether he assented verbally or silently, though the text implies the former. To put it in Roman terms, Cato delivered his opinion (*sententiam dicere*); Hirrus and probably Favonius assented verbally (*verbo adsentiri*), not silently (*pedibus in sententiam ire*).³

2. There can be no doubt that the Domitius concerned is L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 54). Caelius refers again to a 'Domitius' in a letter written in August (Fam. 8.14.1), and to 'L. Domitio' in a letter written in September (Fam. 8.12.1). It is obvious that both passages refer to the same man; Caelius describes him as 'mihi... inimicissimus' in the first passage (8.14.1), and as 'mihi inimicissimo' in the second (8.12.1). This conclusion is hardly new. Caelius' August letter (8.14.1) states that 'Domitius' was defeated by Antony in an election to the augurate, and it is well agreed that the Domitius bested by Antony was L. Domitius.⁴

3. The Lentulus mentioned is almost certainly Spinther; the words 'ut debuerunt' do not seem at all appropriate for L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus (cos. 49), and describe P. Lentulus better than Cn. Lentulus. It does not matter, for this Lentulus is to be removed from the list of intervenants: the words 'circumierunt et laborarunt' denote lobbying efforts. A man who lobbied probably spoke in his turn as well, but this is not attested. The point is underscored by the conjunction 'Furnius et Lentulus'; C. Furnius was a plebeian tribune in 50 B.C., and so was not called upon for his *sententia*.⁵

4. L. Cornelius Balbus must also be removed from the list. The phrase 'operam et sedulitatem' bears no necessary relation to the stage of *interrogatio*. And it seems most natural to understand the clause 'cum Curione vehementer locutus est' as a reference to a personal conversation. But the matter is placed beyond all doubt by the statement Curio made in the senate: 'se eo libentius non intercedere.' By the time Cicero's *supplicatio* had been brought up for a debate and vote, Curio was on Cicero's side, and consequently it was in the time before the debate that Balbus spoke with Curio.

In sum, five men are attested as participants in this debate. Cato made a speech, to which Hirrus certainly and Favonius probably gave oral assent; Domitius Ahenobarbus and Metellus Scipio spoke in favour of the *supplicatio*, though they did not wish to see it decreed.⁶

We cannot agree that Scipio spoke again on 1 December. In a jumbled account

² I give the text of D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge, 1977), with one change in punctuation: his text reads 'his quod tantum voluntatem ostenderunt, pro sententia cum impedire possent non pugnarent...' We should read 'pro sententia' with the first clause, the meaning of which it completes.

³ The three ways of participating in debate are evinced at Liv. 27.34.6-7.

⁴ Cf. T. R. S. Broughton, *Candidates Defeated in Roman Elections: Some Ancient Roman 'Also-Rans'* (Philadelphia, 1991), p. 51.

⁵ The suspension of magistrates from the right to deliver a *sententia* was established by F. Hofmann, *Der römische Senat zur Zeit der Republik* (Berlin, 1847), pp. 85-93, 99-104.

⁶ Since *decerno* in the statement about Cato should refer to the *interrogatio* rather than the *discessio* ('locutus honorifice non decrerat supplicationes'), we can take 'decreant... Domitii, Scipiones' as a reference to the *interrogatio*.

(*Caes.* 30–1) Plutarch seems to make Curio (tr. pl. 50) and Antony (tr. pl. 49) colleagues; after introducing Antony as tribune, Plutarch states that Scipio proposed a motion that Caesar be declared a public enemy if he had not dismissed his army by a fixed date. The chronological confusion of Plutarch does not allow us to place the proposal of Scipio in 50, not even after 10 December: Caesar (*B.C.* 1.2.6) recounts the very same proposal of Scipio, and places it squarely in the first few days of January, 49.

Two additions may be made to the intervenants of 50. While complaining that Cato failed to support his *supplicatio*, Cicero (*Att.* 7.2.7) notes indignantly: ‘at hic idem Bibulo dierum XX.’ The verb is suppressed, but the context of the remark suggests that the *interrogatio* is meant: Cicero has just given a summary of the speech Cato made in the debate on his own *supplicatio* (‘dedit integritatis, iustitiae, clementiae, fidei mihi testimonium’). In another letter of 50 (*Att.* 7.3.5) Cicero refers to Bibulus with the words ‘quem...ornavit Cato’; the verb *orno* provides us with fairly unambiguous evidence for a speech of praise. We must also add M. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 51), who spoke on the subject of tribunician intercession against decrees assigning provinces; Caelius (ap. Cic. *Fam.* 8.13.2) tells us that his *sententia* was the first put to a vote: ‘primaque M. Marcelli sententia pronuntiata esset.’

Including the speech of Pompey attested by Appian, the sources for 50 B.C. name a participant in debate at least eight times – seven men in all, since Cato is seen speaking on two different occasions.

University of the Witwatersrand

F. X. RYAN

HORACE, *ODES* 4.10.2: THE SWEET BIRD OF YOUTH

O crudelis adhuc et Veneris muneribus potens
insperata tuae cum veniet † pluma † superbiae
et quae nunc umeris involitant deciderint comae,
nunc et qui color est puniceae flore prior rosae

mutatus, Ligurine, in faciem verterit hispidam,
dices ‘heu’, quotiens te in speculo videris alterum,
‘quae mens est hodie, cur eadem non puero fuit,
vel cur his animis incolumes non reudent genae?’

2 pluma (P)] bruma (*quod adulescentiae vel virili aetati male convenit*) Bentley: ruga
Markland: poena Withof: plaga Lawinski: multa Housman

So Shackleton Bailey in his recent Teubner edition (Stuttgart, 1991). Housman’s remarks (*Classical Papers*, 148–9) are germane:

Bentley observed that ‘pluma’ never means ‘lanugo’, and that if it did, the ‘in faciem verterit hispidam’ which follows would be pointless repetition; ‘ut ne addam absurdum esse, quam barbam iam *plumam* hoc est *mollem* vocaverit, eandem e vestigio *hispidam* fieri’. Yet his ‘bruma’ cannot be right... the event here contemplated is not the old age of Ligurinus but his arrival at puberty; a consideration fatal also to Cunningham’s ‘ruga’. The right and necessary sense is given by the ‘poena’ of Withof and Lehrs... but I hardly see how in the Horatian archetype ‘poena’ could become ‘pluma’.

Housman then proposes his *multa*. Though I would agree that advanced old age is not here contemplated, and that *bruma* cannot be right, I think Housman was wrong to see puberty as the event inspiring this dreadful prognostication. Be that as it may,