

than it would if it simply evoked the broader associations of myrtle with Venus and sex.

At this point it is appropriate to note that investigations of the *Casina* usually address the issue of its relation to Diphilus' *Kleroumenoi*, which Plautus says is his model (32–4).²¹ Could these aromatic names have originated in Diphilus' play? No names of characters preserved in fragments of Diphilus seem to play similar games. It is also clear from Plautus' adaptation of Menander's *Dis Exapaton* in the *Bacchides* that he could invent new and funnier names for his model's characters. Thus Menander's Syrus is renamed Chrysalus: Chrysalus makes jokes about gold that play on the Greek etymology of his name (*Bacch.* 240, 361–2); and, expressing his own greater ambitions in deceiving his master, says that he disdains 'Parmenos and Syruses who snatch two or three minas from their masters' (*Bacch.* 649–50).²²

Whatever Diphilus may or may not have done, in the *Casina* scents signify the relations of the characters. The aromatic names Pardalisca, Casina, and Myrrhina constitute a spectrum of erotic appeal: the breath of the *πάρδαλις* is alluring, dangerous, and remote from human experience; cassia is an obtainable, though expensive, foreign luxury; myrtle is familiar, appealing, and available close to home. Just as exotic perfumes are not suitable for old men, Casina will elude Lysidamus. Myrrhina, though she aids in Cleostrata's plot against Lysidamus, remains within marriage, at home in the landscape (like myrtle) as she has been all along. Pardalisca, the exotic *πάρδαλις*, excluded from legitimate marriage, will remain an alluring outsider.

University of Washington

CATHERINE CONNORS

²¹ For an overview, see W. T. MacCary, 'The Comic Tradition and Comic Structure in Diphilos' *Kleroumenoi*', *Hermes* 101 (1973), 194–208; see also W. S. Anderson, *Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman Comedy* (Toronto, 1993), pp. 53–9.

²² So noted by E. W. Handley, *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison* (University of London Inaugural Lecture, London, 1968), p. 9.

THE BOOKS OF PHAEDRUS REQUESTED BY CICERO (*ATT.* 13.39)

Around 16 August of 45 B.C. Cicero wrote a brief letter to Atticus (*Att.* 13.39) in which he reminds Atticus to send the books of the Epicurean scholar Phaedrus that he had requested. The Greek words in the text of his request have been corrupted through the centuries:

Libros mihi de quibus ad te antea scripsi velim mittas et maxime
Φαίδρου περὶ θεῶν et <ΠΑΛΙΔΟΣ>.¹

Based on this passage alone, some have assumed with an unwarranted degree of certainty that Phaedrus wrote a work on the gods. In fact, the manuscripts offer no more than the following enigma:

ΦΑΙΔΡΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΟΧΩΝ et ΠΑΛΙΔΟΣ.

¹ D. R. Shackleton-Bailey (ed.), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* (Cambridge, 1966), vol. 5 letter 342 (hereafter S-B.); R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero* (Dublin, 1915), vol. 5 letter 659.

No other evidence exists to tell us the title of anything that Phaedrus wrote. Still, all editors have accepted *περὶ θεῶν* as a reasonable decipherment for the letters 'ΟCΩN' that appear in most manuscripts. Editors have made little headway, though, with the second title. Tyrrell and Purser report several scholars' suggestions (*περὶ Παλλάδος*, *Ἀπολλοδώρου*, and *παντός*), but prefer to leave the text obelized. On the same text Shackleton-Bailey comments, 'Nothing worth record has been made of what follows in the MSS'.²

The historical context in which Cicero wrote this letter, and the timeline that we can trace, albeit tentatively, for the composition of his philosophical works during those days, allows us to imagine still other possibilities for this distorted passage. Earlier in the same letter Cicero mentions that he is thoroughly immersed in writing ('valde enim in scribendo haereo'), and indications from other passages are that he is writing the *de natura deorum*.³ At first glance it seems logical that Cicero would be requesting theological works to help him accurately portray the Epicurean stance on the nature of the gods in the first book of the *de natura deorum*. Philippson argues on the basis of *Att.* 13.38.1, however, that Cicero had already completed Velleius' presentation of Epicurean doctrine (*DND* 1.42–56) and had moved on to Cotta's rebuttal of it (*DND* 1.57–124).⁴ For Velleius' presentation, Cicero apparently relied mainly on two works of Philodemus: *περὶ εὐσεβείας* for the doxographical section, and *περὶ θεῶν* for the theoretical discussion.⁵ Did Cicero now intend to supplement what he gleaned from Philodemus' *περὶ θεῶν* by examining Phaedrus' work of the same name? Possibly, but if Philippson's chronology is correct, he might have been interested in using Phaedrus' work for the rebuttal instead. Part of Cotta's objection to Epicurean theology was that it undermined religious practice (esp. 1.115–124), and so Cicero may have wanted to compare Phaedrus' views with those he had found in Philodemus' *περὶ εὐσεβείας*. Perhaps, then, Cicero was not requesting a theoretically oriented *περὶ θεῶν*, but a work about religious worship, a *περὶ ὁσίων* (a title roughly equivalent to Philodemus' *περὶ εὐσεβείας*). In terms of paleography, *περὶ ὁσίων* has at least the merit of *περὶ θεῶν*: we would only be dealing with the accidental omission of a single vertical stroke. And even though this title does not have as rich a tradition in Epicurean circles as *περὶ θεῶν*, Diogenes Laertius does record that Epicurus himself wrote a work entitled *περὶ ὁσιότητος* (10.27) and that he exhibited outstanding piety towards the gods (*πρὸς θεοὺς ὁσιότης*, 10.10). Furthermore, an inscription found in the Athenian agora reveals that Phaedrus, like Epicurus before him, had been initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries, an indication that he had an interest in religious rites.⁶

The second book requested by Cicero need not relate to the *de natura deorum* at all.

² S.-B., *ibid.*, p. 387.

³ See *Att.* 13.38 (S-B. 5.341, dated c. 15 August 45 B.C.). Taken in conjunction with *de divinatione* 2.3–4, it is clear that Cicero has finished (or just about finished) the *Tusculan Disputations* and is in the midst of writing the *de natura deorum*. For a discussion of the dating see A. S. Pease (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis de natura deorum* (Cambridge, MA, 1955), vol. 1, pp. 20–2.

⁴ R. Philippson, 'Die Quelle der epikureischen Götterlehre in Ciceros erstem Buche de natura deorum', *SO* 19 (1939), 15–40.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 29–31. Also Pease, *op. cit.*, *passim*, and M. Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy*, transl. by D. Obbink (Ann Arbor, 1995), pp. 5–7.

⁶ On this see A. E. Raubitschek, 'Phaidros and his Roman pupils', *Hesperia* 18 (1949), 96–103, esp. 101–2; repr. in *The School of Hellas* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 337–344. For Epicurus' participation in 'all the traditional festivals and sacrifices', see Philodemus, *περὶ εὐσεβείας* 1.730–51 (Obbink) and Diogenes Laertius 10.118.

The rapidity with which Cicero produced his philosophical works during 45 and 44 B.C. implies that Cicero was constantly thinking ahead to upcoming projects.⁷ The urgency evident in the word 'maxime' suggests that the books he wants relate either to works in progress or those in the stage of formulation. Cicero had still to write the *de divinatione* and *de fato* at this time, while the next non-theological work in which Epicurean ideas are touched upon is the *de amicitia*. In the *de divinatione* Cicero dismisses Epicurus out of hand at 1.5, and although Epicurus wrote a work about fate (*περὶ εἰμαρμένης*), Cicero does not seem to have used it or any other Epicurean treatise for his *de fato*. Neither the *de senectute* nor the *de officiis* depends on Epicurean sources. Thus, the only work that lay ahead of Cicero for which he should need Epicurean sources is the *de amicitia*, which was finished during the months following Caesar's assassination in the spring of 44 B.C., perhaps receiving the final touches as late as autumn.⁸ In view of this, the enigmatic second Greek title may have been *περὶ φιλίας*. This conjecture not only provides a reasonable untangling of the Greek letters (especially if one notes the reading of *R*: 'CIAAIAOC'), it fits well with Phaedrus' personality: by all reports, he made up in congeniality what he lacked in intellectual prowess. Furthermore, Cicero's brief treatment of Epicurean ideas on friendship in the *de amicitia* would have a textual basis if this reading were correct. In particular, the idea that friendship should be entered upon for utilitarian reasons ('praesidii adiumentique causa', 13.46) was developed by later Epicureans.⁹ But even this reading is not without its problems: the Epicurean view of friendship is already treated and refuted at length in the *de finibus* (1.65–70, 2.78–85), the sources of which remain a mystery. Still, we cannot rule out the possibility that, for the *de finibus*, which did not have as its primary focus the topic of friendship, Cicero simply recalled what he had heard at the lectures of Zeno of Sidon and Phaedrus himself. Later, while doing a book specifically on the topic of friendship, Cicero may have been anxious to double check his information.

To sum up, I offer the following conjectural text for the end of *Att.* 13.39:

Libros mihi de quibus ad te antea scripsi velim mittas et maxime
Φαίδρου περὶ δόσιων et *περὶ φιλίας*.

In the absence of any solid evidence, neither of the two conjectures is better or worse than what has been offered before by others. The former one, however, by providing a reasonable alternative to the long-accepted reading *περὶ θεῶν*, should at least cause us to rethink the certainty with which we have attributed such a work to Phaedrus, while the latter is a challenge to the notion, inherent in all the other conjectures, that the second work need relate to the *de natura deorum*.

University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa

KIRK SUMMERS

⁷ As *Att.* 13.8 (S.-B. 5.313, dated the Ides of June 45 B.C.) shows. There Cicero asks for Panaetius' *περὶ προνοίας*, which presumably he needed for the upcoming *de divinatione*. Then in the *de divinatione*, Cicero points ahead to the *de fato* at 127, when he promises to discuss in another work how everything happens by fate (but on his change of plans, see *de fato* 1 and 4).

⁸ On this see A. Gilboa, 'A further comment on the dating of the Cicero–Matius correspondence (*Fam.* xi.27/28)', *Historia* 23 (1974), 217–28.

⁹ The idea is introduced at *de finibus* 2.82 with the words 'Attulisti aliud humanius horum recentiorum . . .'