

## CICERO, HORACE, AND MUTUAL FRIENDS: LAMIAE AND VARRONES MURENAE

SUSAN TREGGIARI

DESPITE REVOLUTION, CIVIL WAR, AND PROSCRIPTION, Roman society maintained continuity from the Republic through the triumvirate and into the early Principate, a continuity which is apparent in the persons of such eminent survivors as Augustus himself, Livia, the ex-wife of Ti. Claudius Nero, and Octavia, widow of the consul of 50 B.C. The poets of the first half of Augustus' principate had grown up in the turmoil of the late Republic and had not initially been Octavian's partisans. The fortunes of the political class, of Plancus, Sestius, or the younger Cicero, are chequered and ironical. Some old-established names are eclipsed, while obscure *condottieri* make links with the respectable: M. Agrippa takes to wife an heiress to whom a few years earlier Cicero had sent avuncular messages. Italian families like the Aelii Lamiae continue the smooth ascent begun under the old régime; others, surviving the triumvirate, are ruined after the restoration of the Republic. Given the accidents of survival of men and books, it is not surprising that editors annotating individuals in Horace so often provide a cross-reference to Cicero, and vice-versa. It is the purpose of this paper to assemble the more important people who had contacts with both authors, and to follow in more detail two families whose connection is of particular interest, the Aelii Lamiae and the Varrones Murenæ.<sup>1</sup>

Between the consular from Arpinum and the ex-slave's son from Venusia there is, despite Cicero's web of personal contacts with all classes, little chance of acquaintance. Horace crossed the path of the younger

<sup>1</sup>My thanks are due to Lawrence Giangrande, Colin Wells, C. E. Stevens, and to the learned readers of *Phoenix* who read and greatly improved earlier drafts of this paper. The remaining imperfections, errors, and flights of fancy are entirely my own.

Sources on the individuals discussed are cited in the Appendix. Besides standard abbreviations, the following are used. Carcopino: J. Carcopino, *Les Secrets de la correspondance de Cicéron* (Paris 1947); NH: R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I* (Oxford 1970); Page: T. E. Page, *Q. Horati Flacci Carminum libri IV, Epodon Liber* (London 1895); Palmer: A. Palmer, *The Satires of Horace* (London 1883); Rudd: Niall Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (Cambridge 1966); SB: D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero's letters to Atticus* (Cambridge 1965-1970); Syme, RR: Sir Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939); TP: R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero* (3rd edition, Dublin 1904-1933); Treggiari, RFLR: S. M. Treggiari, *Roman freedmen during the late Republic* (Oxford 1969); Wickham: E. C. Wickham, *Quinti Horati Flacci opera omnia* (Oxford; vol. 1 1874, vol. 2 1891); Wiseman, NMR3: T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C.-A.D. 14* (Oxford 1971). Works of Cicero and Horace are cited without author.

Cicero, if not in Athens, then at least in Brutus' camp, but never mentions the consul of 30. More surprisingly, the consul of 63 does not figure in any Horatian gallery of republican heroes, though the lists often resemble Cicero's own.<sup>2</sup> It is likely that Horace was influenced by Cicero's *books*, particularly his philosophical works.<sup>3</sup> There is also a possibility that he had read an edition of Cicero's letters before writing *Satires* 2 in the late 30's.<sup>4</sup>

The *dramatis personae* of the *Satires* have many points of contact with Cicero's letters. Most of these seem to have been personally known to Horace, who knew and liked Trebatius and knew and disliked Tigellius, just as Cicero had done. Some, like Damasippus and Catius, may have been dead by the time of publication; others, such as the feckless Metella, Aesopus' son, the doctor Craterus, were probably still alive. Dedications of *Odes* to political leaders imply necessarily that Horace addresses survivors from Cicero's day, among them Plancus (*cos.* 42) and Pollio (*cos.* 40). From the younger generation there are Sestius; Messalla Corvinus, the comrade of young Marcus; Torquatus, perhaps a fellow-student from Athens; and a Lamia. By the time he wrote the *Epistles*, Horace had naturally moved further from the society linked to Cicero: but Torquatus survived, and, the tightest link, the family of the Lamiae.

# I

The Aelii Lamiae probably came from Formiae or that area, for Horace, with delicate humour, makes their ancestor the Homeric Lamus (*Odes* 3.17.6-9). Cicero had had a favourite villa there and found himself much courted by the local gentry.<sup>5</sup> Was one of them the Lamia with

<sup>2</sup>See, for instance, NH 157-158.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. E. T. Silk, "Notes on Cicero and the Odes of Horace," *YCS* 13 (1952) 145-158.

<sup>4</sup>Carcopino 2.398-405. His object in suggesting this was to fix a *terminus ante quem* for the "publication" of both the eleven rolls of letters to Atticus and the *Ad Familiares*. He holds that Horace was inspired by his reading of Cicero to mention the sons of Arrius, the son of Aesopus (*filius Aesopi* in Horace, *Aesopi filius* in Cicero, conceivably a verbal echo, but discounted by SB, 5.285-286), the doctor Craterus, and Caecilia Metella, and to draw the fuller portraits of Trebatius, Damasippus, and Catius. Carcopino attaches weight to the mention by both writers of Trebatius' passion for swimming (*Fam.* 7.10.2, *Sat.* 2.1.7-9), but Horace could well have known this without reading the letters. In conclusion, the evidence does not compel us to believe that Horace borrows characters from Cicero. On the composition date of *Sat.* 2 see now G. Williams, *Horace (G & R New Surveys in the Classics* 6 [Oxford 1972]) 20.

<sup>5</sup>We first hear of the Caietanum/Formianum in 66 (*Att.* 1.4.3; cf. 1.3.2 of 67), but we do not know if Cicero bought or inherited it. It was outside Formiae, on the bay of Caieta (O. E. Schmidt, "Ciceros Villen," *NJbb* 3 [1899] 348-355). Cicero too made learned allusions to Lamus in describing Formiae (*Att.* 2.13.2), but the trick is a common one. He was there in the spring of 59 (*Att.* 2.4.6; 14.2 and 15.3 mention the sociable neighbours), repaired the villa after his exile (*Att.* 4.2.7), and was there at least in the winter of 50-49 (SB 4 App. 1) and in April 44 (*Att.* 14.7.1).

whom in 56 he claimed *summa familiaritas* (Sest. 29)? The geographical setting for their intercourse need not be Formiae alone. A route via Minturnae and the Liris valley links Formiae and the paternal estate of Cicero at Isola del Liri.<sup>6</sup> Like Cicero, Lamia may have had other estates apart from the *villa rustica* near the sea described in *Odes* 3.17.<sup>7</sup> Other evidence suggests a connection with Arpinum. In the *De Oratore* (2.262) Cicero makes C. Caesar in his discourse on wit cite an example of fine irony:

*Invertuntur autem verba, ut, Crassus apud M. Perpernam iudicem pro Aculeone cum diceret, aderat contra Aculeonem Gratidiano L. Aelius Lamia, deformis, ut nostis; qui cum interpellaret odiose, "audiamus" inquit "pulchellum puerum" Crassus; cum esset arrisum, "non potui mihi" inquit Lamia "formam ipse fingere, ingenium potui;" tum hic "audiamus" inquit "disertum;" multo etiam arrisum est vehementius.*<sup>8</sup>

The personnel of the hearing, not the forcefulness of the repartee, must engage our attention here. The litigants were both kinsmen of Cicero: Aculeo, husband of his maternal aunt Helvia (*De Or.* 2.2.), and Marius Gratidianus, brother's son to his paternal grandmother Gratidia. Their dispute may well have been a local Arpinate squabble.<sup>9</sup> In that case, Lamia, who spoke on behalf of Gratidianus, may have done so because of a country connection. It is clear, however, that he, like Gratidianus, was also a somebody in the great world, since Crassus is made to assume that his hearers know him, at least by sight. The date of the case will not be long before 91, the dramatic date of the dialogue:<sup>10</sup> one might conjecture that the young Cicero had been present at the hearing.

By 58 at latest, Cicero was on close terms with one L. Aelius Lamia, whom, in view of the coincidence of *praenomen*, we should presumably identify<sup>11</sup> as the son of Crassus' victim. Lamia was relegated by the

<sup>6</sup>Minturnae route: *Att.* 16.13.1. The Cicerones had other land in the area, Q. Cicero's Arcanum at Arce, south of Arpinum on the way to Aquinum, first mentioned in 56 (*QF* 2. 6 [5]. 4): it is unclear whether this was a recent purchase or inherited.

<sup>7</sup>Line 10 suggests that the villa was near the coast. The Liri joins the Garigliano before it reaches the sea.

<sup>8</sup>"Words may be used ironically, as when Crassus was speaking in front of the judge M. Perperna on behalf of Aculeo, and L. Aelius Lamia (an ugly man, as you know) was appearing against Aculeo for Gratidianus. When Lamia rudely interrupted him, Crassus said 'Let us listen to this handsome boy.' Laughter in court. 'I could not shape my own appearance,' said Lamia, 'only my talents.' 'Then,' said Crassus, 'let us listen to this eloquent orator.' The laughter at this was louder still."

<sup>9</sup>On the family see C. Nicolet, "Arpinum, Aemilius Scaurus et les Tullii Cicerones," *REL* 45 (1967) 276-304 (who does not mention this case) and the succinct account of D. L. Stockton, *Cicero, a political biography* (London 1971) 1-5.

<sup>10</sup>According to A. S. Wilkins, *M. Tullii Ciceronis de Oratore libri tres* (Oxford 1892) *ad loc.* and H. Gundel, *RE* 9A (1961) 354-355, s.v. "Visellius 1," this was probably a civil case in which Perperna presided while consul, in 92. But the argument is not cogent, for a *iudex* did not need to be a magistrate.

<sup>11</sup>As does Groag (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 199).

consul Gabinius because he had supported Cicero.<sup>12</sup> This, according to Cicero, scandalised the *equites* whose *princeps* Lamia was (*Fam.* 11.16.2), and their hostility extended to Piso (*Pis.* 64). Lamia was restored (perhaps when Gabinius went out of office), for in 54 we find him in Rome. Tyrian envoys had come to the Senate with a testimonial to Gabinius'<sup>13</sup> good government of Syria, perhaps in gratitude for a grant of tax-immunity. (Gabinius himself was still in his province and did not reach Rome until the following September.) The Tyrians were opposed in the Senate by a delegation of *publicani*, of whom Lamia was one.<sup>14</sup> He engaged the consul in an exchange of words worthy of the elder Lamia:

*Eodem igitur die (sc. Idibus Februarii) Tyriis est senatus datus frequens; frequentes contra Syriaci publicani. Vehementer vexatus Gabinius; exagitati tamen a Domitio publicani quod eum essent cum equis persecuti. L. noster Lamia paulo ferocius, cum Domitius dixisset "Vestra culpa haec acciderunt, equites Romani; dissolute enim iudicatis," "Nos iudicamus, vos laudatis" inquit. Actum est eo die nihil; nox diremit.* (QF 2. 12 [11]. 2)<sup>15</sup>

The incident gives us some further information on the position of Lamia: although an *eques* he is involved in politics, a partisan of Cicero and a staunch *inimicus* of Gabinius.

Cicero continued to exchange *beneficia* with Lamia. In June, 51, the financier, along with Atticus and others, was helping him in his awkward involvement with the purchase of Milo's property (*Att.* 5.8.3). From Cilicia, Cicero wrote to P. Silius, pro-praetor of Bithynia-Pontus, claiming his friendship *propter Lamiae nostri coniunctionem et singularem necessitudinem* (*Fam.* 13.62). In 48, Lamia acted as an intermediary between Cicero and Antony (*Att.* 11.7.2), and it is clear that he was *persona grata* to the Caesarians. It is likely that the dictator made him a senator.<sup>16</sup> In 45 we find him as aedile, responsible for the *Ludi Romani*, on letter-writing terms with Caesar, confiding in Balbus and still friendly with Cicero, whom he visited at Tusculum in August (*Att.* 13.45.1). A coldness, on Cicero's part at least, will have followed Lamia's scandalous participation in the celebration of the anniversary of Munda at the

<sup>12</sup>*Sest.* 29; *Red. Sen.* 12; *Pis.* 64, cf. 23; *Fam.* 12.29, 11.6.2, 11.17.1.

<sup>13</sup>For discussion and sources on Gabinius see E. M. Sanford, "The career of Aulus Gabinius," *TAPA* 70 (1939) 64-92; E. Badian, "The early career of A. Gabinius (cos. 58 B.C.)," *Philologus* 103 (1959) 87-99, and R. G. M. Nisbet, *Cicero: In L. Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio* (Oxford 1961) Appendix 5.

<sup>14</sup>It emerges from the context that he was not present as a senator.

<sup>15</sup>"On the same day the Tyrians were given audience before a crowded meeting of the Senate; crowds of Syrian *publicani* came to oppose them. Gabinius was sharply criticised; however, the *publicani* were rebuked by Domitius because they had given him a mounted escort. 'It was your fault that this happened, *equites Romani*, for you give lax judgments,' said Domitius. Our friend Lamia retorted rather fiercely, 'We give judgments, you give testimonials.' Nothing was accomplished that day; we adjourned at nightfall."

<sup>16</sup>Cf. Syme, *RR* 81-82.

Parilia after the murder of Caesar (*Att.* 14.14.1). But by early 43, Cicero was sufficiently reconciled to write three letters, one recommending Lamia's business interests to Cornificius in Africa<sup>17</sup> and two to D. Brutus supporting his candidature for the praetorship (*Fam.* 12.29; 11.16.2, 17). Both recipients were ex-Caesarians now supporting the Senate; it is likely that Lamia was following their line and that of Cicero.

The proscriptions and the murder of Cicero were not far off. Now the evidence becomes sparse, difficult, and intriguing. H. H. Davis<sup>18</sup> has suggested, on the basis of three statements in the Latin Anthology (in poems 608, 611, 614; cf. 603) that it was this Lamia who is there said to have burned the mutilated corpse of Cicero. The poets' ultimate source might be Livy, whose surviving account (*apud Sen. Suas.* 6.17) does not cover the disposal of the body. Cicero was intercepted and killed near Formiae on his way from his villa to the sea.<sup>19</sup> Lamia as a neighbour, perhaps even the owner of the wooded land where the murder took place, and an old friend, might well help Cicero's loyal servants to dispose decently, though secretly, of his body.<sup>20</sup>

If Davis is right, then the trial of Lamia which followed acquires extra interest. According to the elder Seneca (*Suas.* 6.14–15), in his account of the attitudes taken by historians towards Cicero, only Pollio thought that Cicero might have appealed to Antony against his proscription, and only Pollio dared affirm, *in ea oratione quam pro Lamia edidit*, that Cicero was ready to deny authorship of the *Philippics*. This statement, says Seneca, appeared only in the "published" version. He explicitly states that he is here relying on the testimony of witnesses *actioni eius pro Lamia qui interfuerunt*. The falsity of the allegation is apparent, since Pollio did not dare to make it when the triumvirs were around, or insert it in his *Historiae*. What can we deduce about the circumstances in which the *pro Lamia* was delivered? The word *actio* suggests (though it does not necessarily imply) a judicial context.<sup>21</sup> When did the trial take place? The *terminus post quem* is the death of Cicero on December 7, 43, for in the excerpts from Pollio's speech the past tense is used. Since Seneca says that

<sup>17</sup>Later inscriptions (*CIL* 8.25943, 26416) attest *saltus Lamiani* in Africa. Other property included suburban *horti* which Cicero in March 43 thought of buying for Tullia's shrine (*Att.* 12.21.2, 22.3, 29.2). The Lamiae who rented Q. Cicero's house on the Carinae in 56 (*QF* 2.3.7) may be *L. noster Lamia* and family.

<sup>18</sup>"Cicero's Burial," *Phoenix* 12 (1958) 174–177.

<sup>19</sup>Livy *apud Sen. Suas.* 6.17; Plut. *Cic.* 47.4–48.4; App. *BC* 4.19–20; *Vir. Ill.* 81.6.

<sup>20</sup>There is an alleged tomb of Cicero at Formiae, which might be a monument marking the traditional place of his death, rather than his grave. Schmidt, *Nybb* 3 (1899) 345 argues on the, to me insufficient, evidence of Martial 11.48 that Cicero was buried at Arpinum.

<sup>21</sup>The word can be used of any speech: Pollio could have interceded for Lamia as Cicero had done for Ligarius. But a trial, criminal rather than civil, seems more likely.

Pollio could not have made his allegation *sub triumvirorum conscientia*, André<sup>22</sup> has suggested the departure of Antony and Octavian from Rome, which took place at latest at the end of the summer of 42, as a *terminus ante quem*. It might be possible to pin-point the date more exactly. In 43 Lamia had been a candidate for the praetorship. We are not well informed about the praetors of 42, but he may have been among them.<sup>23</sup> Among his politic assortment of connections, we have noted Antony (in 48) and now Pollio. The triumvirs could not afford to accept as magistrates only men with an unblemished record of friendship with all three of them. The ex-equestrian from Formiae would be a supporter worth gaining; it might also be salutary to remind Cicero's old partisan to watch his step. We might conjecture, then, that Lamia achieved the praetorship for 42 and that he was tried therefore before he entered office,<sup>24</sup> between December 7 and 31. We have no evidence on the charge. But it must have been relevant for Pollio to mention Cicero, presumably in arguing that Lamia's loyalty to the new régime was to be relied on. André<sup>25</sup> suggests that Pollio either wanted to make Lamia look nobler than Cicero or to show that Cicero had been ready to compromise and to argue that Lamia was similarly inclined. André himself prefers the former idea, but it is hard to see how intransigence would have recommended Lamia to the triumvirs. If, on the other hand, the opposing counsel had accused Lamia of having disposed of Cicero's body<sup>26</sup> and being therefore an enemy of the régime, it *would* have been appropriate for Pollio to argue (with elaborations introduced into the published version)<sup>27</sup> that Lamia had grounds for thinking that piety towards Cicero was not inconsistent with loyalty to

<sup>22</sup>Jacques André, *La Vie et l'œuvre de C. Asinius Pollion* (Paris 1949) 69.

<sup>23</sup>Sources concentrate so exclusively on the chequered careers of triumvirs or on improving or thrilling anecdotes of the proscriptions that we lack information about the manner or timing of praetorian and lesser elections in 43. I would conjecture that after Octavian and Pedius had been elected as *suffecti* on August 19, the delayed elections for the lesser magistrates of 42 were carried out by the hard-working Pedius, before the *Lex Titia* established the triumvirate on November 27 and before the proscriptions. The evidence that Lamia became a *vir praetorius* is discussed below, p. 251.

<sup>24</sup>Magistrates were exempt from prosecution: *Dig.* 2.4.2 (Ulp.): *In ius vocari non oportet neque consulem neque praefectum neque praetorem neque proconsulem neque ceteros magistratus qui imperium habent*. Cf. 47.10.32 and *Tac. Ann.* 3.37. I accept E. J. Weinrib's argument ("The Prosecution of Roman magistrates," *Phoenix* 22 [1968] 32–56 and "The Prosecution of magistrates-designate," *Phoenix* 25 [1971] 144–150) that magistrates-elect were not exempt, against D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "The Prosecution of Roman magistrates-elect," *Phoenix* 25 (1970) 162–165.

<sup>25</sup>*Loc. cit.* (above, note 22).

<sup>26</sup>Rendering aid and comfort to living *proscripti* was punished with proscription (*App. BC* 4.11) and cannot have been alleged.

<sup>27</sup>This is open to the objection that insertion in the speech could have been made purely out of malice to Cicero.

the Caesarians. This is of course mere conjecture, but I think it accounts for the few known facts.

Presumably Pollio won the case, for it was seldom worth circulating an unsuccessful speech. The family of the Aelii Lamiae, typical of the new Italian nobility, went on to serve Octavian with distinction.<sup>28</sup> A morbid anecdote may provide the epilogue to the story of Cicero's Lamia. Valerius Maximus and Pliny<sup>29</sup> tell how a certain L. Lamia, *praetorius vir*, revived after being laid on the funeral pyre but could not be rescued from the flames. There is nothing to show whether this was Cicero's Lamia (? praetor 42) or his son, a praetorian legate of Augustus. If it was the former, the man who rescued Cicero's body met an ironic end. The son chose his side wisely in the civil war and distinguished himself as a general, governing Nearer Spain in 24–22.<sup>30</sup> Of his two sons, one held the consulship in A.D. 3 and went on to govern Africa in A.D. 15–16 and to be Prefect of the City in 32. He died the following year. The other, probably the younger since he bore the *praenomen* Quintus, died young, having held the office of moneyer.<sup>31</sup>

Lamiae appear four times in Horace. In the first three books of *Odes*, Horace asks the muse to weave a garland, that is, inspire a poem, for his friend Lamia (1.26.8); greeting a certain Numida returning from Spain (presumably from the wars) he says that at the thanksgiving feast Numida *caris multa sodalibus/nulli plura tamen dividit oscula/quam dulci Lamiae, memor/actae non alio rege puertiae/mutataeque simul togae* (1.36.5–9); finally 3.17 is a full-scale ode addressed to the noble descendant of Lamus, suggesting an indoor feast for Lamia and his household on the morrow, when the forecasters call for bad weather. A few years later, Horace alludes to the grief of Lamia who is mourning for his dead brother, in terms which make it clear that he is a close friend, *me quamvis Lamiae pietas et cura moretur/fratrem maerentis, rapto de fratre dolentis/insolabiliter . . .* (*Epp.* 1.14.6–8). This last reference is clearly to the Legate's son, the future consul and prefect. But the three passages from the *Odes* are more doubtful. Nisbet and Hubbard on 1.26 refer this and 3.17 to the Legate and 1.36 to one or other of his two sons.<sup>32</sup> I agree with them that 1.26 and 3.17 are most probably addressed, like other odes, to a man who had already made his mark in public life, probably a contempo-

<sup>28</sup>Syme, *RR* 194, suggests that they bought immunity from proscription.

<sup>29</sup>Val. Max. 1.8.12, Pliny *NH* 7.173.

<sup>30</sup>Dio 53.29.1–2, Cassiod. *Chron.Min.* 2.135; cf. Syme, *RR* 329–330, 333.

<sup>31</sup>For references and a fuller account of all three see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 199, 200, 203. I have deviated from Groag's opinion on two points: he makes the future Legate Pollio's client and he attributes all the Horatian references to the future consul of A.D.3. It seems to me that chronological probability favours the view I have given in the text.

<sup>32</sup>NH date 1.26 to ca 26–25; some earlier editors (e.g. A. S. Wilkins, *The Epistles of Horace* [London 1885] 176) favour ca 30.

rary of Horace himself, the son of Cicero's younger contemporary. But I do not see why the gaiety of Numida<sup>33</sup> and the Lamia of 1.36 implies their youth. Horace pictures the relaxation of his own contemporaries from war (2.7) or politics (2.9, 3.8, etc.) quite as often as the drinking-parties of his juniors (1.27). The charm of shared childhood memories would be more poignant to older men than to the young Lamia who had only just grown up. I would prefer to assume that 1.36 also refers to the legate; one advantage is thereby gained, that all three references in the *Odes* would be to Horace's contemporary. But his friendship was to extend to the son, the future consul of A.D. 3, whom he tried to comfort in his grief for his brother.

This distinguished administrator wins a tribute from Tacitus in his epilogue on the year A.D. 33: *Extremo anni mors Aelii Lamiae funere censorio celebrata, qui administrandae Syriae imagine tandem exolutus urbi prae fuerat. Genus illi decorum, vivida senectus; et non permissa provincia dignationem addiderat* (Ann. 6.27). The family's wealth had increased with its political position: *horti Lamiani* were inherited by Tiberius.<sup>34</sup> The family itself continued, maintained in high office probably by lineal descendants of the consul of A.D. 3: a son or grandson *frater Arvalis* under Claudius; L. Aelius Plautius Lamia Aelianus consul in A.D. 80; L. Aelius Lamia Aelianus, probably his son, consul in A.D. 116, and finally the last known representative, Plautius L. [f. Aelius La] mia Silvanus, who died young in Hadrian's reign, but not before he had formed an alliance with the daughter of the future emperor Antoninus Pius.<sup>35</sup> To Juvenal this family which had entered the Senate in Cicero's day and had held high office in the time of Horace had come to represent the flower of the ancient senatorial nobility. He says of Domitian that it was not his killing of aristocrats like Lamia the consul of A.D. 80, but the threat which he finally presented to the *canaille*, which brought about his assassination: *Sed periit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus/coeperat. Hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti* (4.153-154; cf. 6.385).

The Lamiae in their steady rise over two troubled centuries epitomise the success-story of the Italian upper-class. How did they do it? We have clear evidence for their important business interests, for military and administrative abilities. Except for the last of the line, we know nothing of their marriage connections. But thanks to the connection of the first four generations with Cicero and Horace, we know something of their *amicitiae* and of their roots in Latium. Though Cicero was above, and Horace below the Lamiae in social status, Cicero counts the elder Lamia

<sup>33</sup>Unknown apart from this one appearance. NH suggest he may have served with the Legate, which would give a nice point, if their identification of Lamia is right.

<sup>34</sup>Suet. *Cal.* 59, *Philo Leg.* 44.351; cf. n. 17.

<sup>35</sup>*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 202, 204-206.



as a friend (in a public statement at least, *Sest.* 29) and the son as *L. noster Lamia*, while Horace in his turn calls the grandson "my *Lamia*." All these *amicitiae* were in part political—for the *Lamiae* the support of the Arpinate consul or even of the patriotic poet was not to be sneezed at, and Cicero and Horace too might derive advantage from the relationship—but it cannot be doubted that there was also a personal liking, and probably between Cicero and his *Lamia* a self-sacrificing friendship.

## II

In contrast, another family which could boast acquaintance with both Cicero and Horace, but which, after surviving three civil wars, is ruined under the *Pax Augusta*.

In the 40's we hear from Cicero of a man called A. Varro, devoted to Cicero himself and fond of Tiro, who was on his way to Greece from Latium in February, 49, and who was to assist Tiro to leave Patrae, where he had been convalescing (*Fam.* 16.12.6). The date and his destination suggest that this man should be identified with the Pompeian A. Varro who answered Caesar's spokesman Vatinius when he was sent to propose peace-talks the following year.<sup>36</sup> It is further possible that this Varro is to be identified with Varro Murena, at whose urging Cicero recommended a businessman to Ser. Sulpicius in 46 (*Fam.* 13.22). Varro Murena will be the same as the man attested as aedile in or before 44.<sup>37</sup> He must be a Licinius Murena adopted by a Terentius Varro, his real father presumably the consul of 62, Cicero's client L. Murena, and his adoptive father perhaps A. Terentius Varro, who had served, probably along with the future consul of 62, under the elder L. Murena, *propraetor* of Asia 84–81.<sup>38</sup> The date of birth of both real and adoptive father is unknown, and so is the date of the adoption.

Horace has two mentions of a Murena and one of a Licinius. The earliest is in *Satires* 1.5.38, where we are told that Murena offered his house to Maecenas' party when they passed through Formiae on their way to Brundisium. In *Odes* 3.19 he celebrates a Murena's adlection to the augurship (?31 B.C.) with a poem and a party. Knowledge of the family (though common knowledge) is also indicated by a reference in *Odes* 2.2.5–6 to the generosity of Proculeius towards his brothers: *Vivet extento*

<sup>36</sup>Caesar *BC* 3.19.4; cf. *MRR* 2.279.

<sup>37</sup>*CIL* 1.<sup>2</sup> 2.2514 = *ILS* 6075 = *ILLRP* 704; cf. *Phil.* 13.26.

<sup>38</sup>Consul of 62: F. Münzer *RE* 13 (1926) 446–449, s.v. Licinius (123); Varro: Münzer *RE* 5A (1934) 678–680, s.v. Terentius (82); *propraetor* of Asia: Münzer *RE* 13.444–446, s.v. Licinius (122). The use of the *praenomen* Aulus by the Varrones Murenarum shows that the adopting Varro was A., and this is the only known A. Varro of the right date. See further W. C. McDermott, "Varro Murena," *TAPA* 72 (1941) 255–265, especially 256–258.

*Proculeius aevo/notus in fratres animi paterni* . . . The scholiasts explain that Proculeius had shared his *patrimonium* with his *fratres* Scipio and Murena, who had been ruined by civil war.<sup>39</sup> *Fratres* could mean cousins, half-brothers, or full-brothers adopted into other families, or any combination of these. Various hypotheses have been advanced about Scipio, none of them certain. The relationship of Murena and Proculeius is most economically explained as that of uterine brothers, whose mother married first a Proculeius and then a Murena.<sup>40</sup>

Horace's last possible reference to Murena is in *Odes* 2.10, where he adjures a Licinius to follow *aurea mediocritas* and eschew the dangers of the open sea (elsewhere a symbol of civil war) and of the rocky coast. According to the orthodox view of commentators,<sup>41</sup> Licinius is one and the same as the Murena mentioned elsewhere by Horace and the scholiasts. If this is right, a coherent picture emerges: a Licinius Murena who chose the wrong side in the civil wars, but who had a close relative strategically placed on the winning side, and was restored to position at Rome when, like the ex-republicans young Cicero and Messalla Corvinus, he became an augur.

The Murena involved in the abortive plot of Fannius Caepio would *a priori* be likely to be the same as the Murena mentioned by Horace (as long as the *Odes* were published before the plot was discovered), since no other descendants of either the consul of 62 or of his brother Gaius are known.<sup>42</sup> Our best source calls the conspirator Varro Murena (Suet. *Tib.* 8) and Tacitus probably refers to the same man as a Varro (*Ann.* 1.10); Velleius, who ought to get it right, calls him L. Murena (2.91.2); Dio, from whom we might not expect accuracy, calls him Licinius Murena (54.3.3). So only Suetonius makes it clear that he was both a Varro and a Murena. But the Capitoline *Fasti* attest an *A.T[erentius A.f. —.n. Varr]*o

<sup>39</sup>Twice according to Ps.-Acron: *Proculeium equitem Romanum laudat, amicum Augusti' qui pius sic erga fratres suos Scipionem et Murenā fuit, ut cum spoliatis bello civili patrimonium suum ex integro divideret, quod cum eis iam ante diviserat*. Porphyrio has the same account, except that he does not talk of two divisions. Since Porphyrio draws on Acron and ps.-Acron draws on both Acron and Porphyrio, it is hard to decide which deserves more credence. If the story of the repeated division is right, Murena perhaps sided first with Brutus and then with Antony. For Proculeius' strong position as a loyal partisan of Octavian see Tac. *Ann.* 4.40, Pliny *NH* 36.183, Juv. 7.94, Dio 54.3.4; for his coining cf. M. Grant, *Roman Imperial Money* (London 1954) 19.

<sup>40</sup>Hanslik *RE* 23 (1957) 72–74, s.v. Proculeius (2). Augustus' friend is the first known member of the *gens*. Murena's father was socially superior to a Proculeius, however wealthy. The *animus paternus* is more easily explained if Murena was younger, the child then of a later marriage.

<sup>41</sup>But not of Porphyrio, who talks of a Licinius Valgius. The Licinian *gens* was particularly large. Commentators who identify Licinius as a Murena include Wickham 1.135–136, Page 252–253 and J. B. Lechatelier, *Horace* (Paris 1931) 66–67.

<sup>42</sup>Münzer *RE* 13 (1926) 444, s.v. Licinius (119).

*Murena* as consul for 23. I do not want to tread on the smouldering ashes of the controversy about the date of Caepio's plot and the puzzle of this inscription,<sup>43</sup> but will merely say dogmatically that it appears to me, on the evidence we have, that this A. Varro Murena is the alleged conspirator who appears under so many names in the literary sources. My concern is not, however, to make any conjectures about the plot, but just to collect evidence on the name: if the identification of consul and plotter is wrong, then my argument on the name and consequently the identity of the plotter will be weakened but not shattered.<sup>44</sup>

The *Fasti's* *praenomen* "A." suggests A. Terentius Varro as an ascendant; Velleius' "L." recalls the consul of 62, L. Murena. Cicero's Pompeian friend was A. Varro; the *praenomen* of the Varro Murena who held the aedileship under Caesar is not attested. Let us conjecture that the son of L. Murena was adopted by A. Varro, at a date prior to 46, probably considerably earlier. He would be called A. Terentius Varro Murena, keeping his old *cognomen*, as did many of his contemporaries, in preference to "Licinianus" formed from his previous *gentilicium*. He used the two *cognomina* even on a public monument, presumably because they sounded more distinguished. Several points make it unlikely that this first Varro Murena lived to plot against Augustus. One is that he would have been made to wait a long time for his augurship and (on my view) much too long for his consulship. Another is that such a life-span cannot be reconciled with the Horatian commentators' information on Proculeius. Thirdly and more compellingly, there is evidence that Terentia Maecenatis was the conspirator's sister (Dio 54.3.5; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 66.3). But if this Murena was the first to combine the two names, then we would have to choose between two suspicious alternatives: either she was not a sister by blood but the daughter of an unknown A. Varro, or she had been adopted along with her brother. Much the most economical and probable assumption is that the conspirator was the son of the first Varro Murena and that Terentia was his full sister. We do not know when she was born,

<sup>43</sup>I accept almost all the arguments of D. L. Stockton, "Primus and Murena," *Historia* 14 (1965) 18–40, followed by S. Jameson, "22 or 23?" *Historia* 18 (1969) 204–229, in favour of the identification of the consul of 23 with the "conspirator," against K. M. Atkinson, "Constitutional and legal aspects of the trials of Marcus Primus and Varro Murena," *Historia* 9 (1960) 440–473; R. Bauman, "Tiberius and Murena," *Historia* 15 (1966) 420–432; M. Swan, "The Consular *Fasti* of 23 B.C. and the conspiracy of Varro Murena," *HSCP* 71 (1967) 235–248, and others. Swan's proof that the Capitoline *Fasti*, unlike the rest, mention consuls-designate who died or were disqualified before entering office, does not to my mind demolish the possibility that Murena was removed from office by a despot and suffered *damnatio memoriae*.

<sup>44</sup>If the identification is disproved, then we have a consul-designate (as Swan argues, cf. n. 43) who died before taking office, A. Terentius Varro Murena, and, as I would argue, L. Varro Murena, who could only be his brother.

but she was still attractive enough in 16 for rumours to go around that Augustus wanted to elope with her.<sup>45</sup> She may have been married to Maecenas by the time that Murena lent the Formian house to Maecenas, in the early 30's. A birth-date in the late 50's would suit her; her brother ought to be older.<sup>46</sup>

It is possible then that the second Varro Murena was born before his father's adoption. This would help to explain his retention (if the identification is right) of *all* the names of his branch of the Murenæ. But even without this conjecture, Varro Murena's practice can be shown to be normal. Syme<sup>47</sup> has mentioned in this connection the son of M. Pupius Piso Frugi (*cos.* 61), who apparently chose to suppress the name Pupius, which his father had acquired through adoption by a man of no political distinction, and to revert to the name M. Calpurnius Piso Frugi. The evidence on men who were themselves adopted<sup>48</sup> shows the same trend. The tyrannicide Brutus, born M. Junius Brutus, was adopted by his maternal uncle and became Q. Caepio Brutus. Like Varro Murena, he used his adoptive *cognomen* as if it were a *nomen*. He was frequently called by his old name, including the *praenomen*, Marcus, under which he is still generally known.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, adopted by Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius (probably in his will in 63) became Q. Metellus Pius Scipio.<sup>50</sup> M. Licinius Lucullus, also adopted by a Varro, became M. Terentius M.f. Varro Lucullus in official usage, but was more conveniently called M. Lucullus.<sup>51</sup> So Varro Murena could, like Brutus, have used either *praenomen*, and, like Frugi, have reverted to the *nomen* of his grandfather on occasion, recalling the consulship of 62 and the military record of the Licinii Murenæ, by calling himself "L. Licinius Varro Murena" instead of "A. Terentius Varro Murena".<sup>52</sup> In that case, all our ancient sources will be right—at least in parts.

<sup>45</sup>Dio 54.19.3; cf. 55.7.5. See Sen. *Prov.* 3.10 on her coldness to Maecenas and Dig. 24.1.64 on an awkward divorce.

<sup>46</sup>Hanslik *RE* 23.72 guesses that Murena was born ca 56.

<sup>47</sup>*Historia* 14 (1965) 15, citing *JRS* 50 (1960) 15.

<sup>48</sup>Cf. Münzer *RE* Suppl. 5 (1931) 369–370, s.v. Iunius (55a).

<sup>49</sup>Gelzer *RE* 10 (1918) 976, s.v. Iunius (53). *Cognomen-nomen*: Val. Max. (ed. C. Kempf, Teubner) p. 589, *Incerti auctoris liber de praenominibus* etc., para. 2. Similarly Q. Caecilius Q.f. Pomponianus Atticus continued after his adoption in 58 (*Att.* 3.20) to be called T. Pomponius (e.g., *Att.* 7.7.7).

<sup>50</sup>Münzer *RE* 3 (1897) 1224–1228, s.v. Caecilius (99).

<sup>51</sup>Münzer *RE* 13 (1926) 414–418, s.v. Licinius (109). "M. Lucullus": *Verr.* 2.23, *Clu.* 137, etc.

<sup>52</sup>Simultaneous use of two *praenomina* even at this date might be possible: cf. C. Silius A. Caecina Largus, *cos.* A.D.13 (R. Syme, *Ten Studies in Tacitus* [Oxford 1970] 142). The argument on the use of two *nomina* would gain support if the possibility be conceded that "Licymnia," thought to mask Terentia Maecenatis in *Odes* 2.12, was meant to recall "Licinia." "Licinnia," metrically equivalent to "Licymnia," is, especially in Greek texts, a variant for Licinia (cf. Dig. 24.3.66 pr., Plut. *C.Gr.* 17.5, *IG*<sup>1</sup> 7.110, 1777, etc.).

The only reason for identifying Horace's (?Licinius) Murena with this polyonymous Varro Murena is that the latter was Maecenas' brother-in-law and that such a relationship fits well with what we know of Horace's Murena and Licinius. We may add an *e silentio* argument that no plain Licinii Murenæ are known from this period.<sup>53</sup> If the above reconstruction is right—and admittedly it is merely one of several possibilities, but the one which appears to me the most probable—then Horace's Murena was the son of Cicero's Pompeian friend A. Varro and grandson of his client L. Murena. At a guess, the ex-Pompeian may have fought with Horace at Philippi, so that his son's patrimony was confiscated. I would also guess a geographical connection between Cicero and A. Varro. The home of the Licinii Murenæ was at Lanuvium, where Cicero perhaps had a *deversorium*<sup>54</sup> to break the journey on his way to his southern villas, including Formiæ. But *Fam.* 16.12.5–6 suggests that it was at Cicero's headquarters at Formiæ that he met A. Varro in the winter of 49. If this is none other than the first Varro Murena, then he may have already owned the house which was later to receive Horace.

Two links are involved here: shared political sympathies and (literally) common ground. These are among the factors observable in other *amicitiæ* connecting Cicero with Horace. Those who shared Cicero's policies mostly fought for Brutus at Philippi: his own son, L. Bibulus, Messalla Corvinus, all fellow-students who became officers; Sestius, son of Cicero's old client and pro-quaestor to Brutus in 43–42. Other politicians are the Lamiae, Plancus (hardly a real friend), Pollio, the Furnii.<sup>55</sup> Among intellectuals is the jurist Trebatius Testa, who “pouvait parler de Lucrèce à Virgile, de Cicéron à Tite-Live, de Catulle à Properce,”<sup>56</sup> and certainly of Cicero to Horace. There is a group of literary men, overlapping with the political leaders: in a satire (1.10.83–88) Horace mentions among *docti* and *amici* his late comrades, Messalla and Bibulus, Pollio, Furnius and (probably) the younger Servius Sulpicius Rufus. One of the Lamiae (the Legate or the consul of A.D. 3?) had pretensions to poetic fame.<sup>57</sup> Some friends or acquaintances belong to the world of Rome, in which Horace lived as a clerk and protégé of Maecenas: it may be in this milieu that he met such men as Damasippus. Certainly in Rome one could not entirely avoid the obnoxious Tigellius, nor miss the gossip about actresses, misers, spendthrifts, and adulteresses.<sup>58</sup> But there were

<sup>53</sup>Unless the plotter were one. L. Murena (*cos.* 62) might have had another son, but there is no trace. Cf. n. 42.

<sup>54</sup>Murenæ: *Mur.* 86, 90; *CIL*<sup>2</sup> 1.2.772 = *ILS* 897. *Deversorium*: *Att.* 12.44.3, 13.26.2, 13.34, 14.2.4, 14.4.1.

<sup>55</sup>On all these and those who follow see Appendix.

<sup>56</sup>Gaston Boissier, *Cicéron et ses amis* (Paris 1865) 248–249.

<sup>57</sup>Ps.-Acron on *Ars P.* 288.

<sup>58</sup>Appendix part 1.

other areas much frequented by the upper-class:<sup>59</sup> near Rome it happens that Cicero chose Tusculum and Horace Tibur, but both visited the coastal resorts of Latium and Campania, notoriously Baiae. The place that occurs most, however, in the background of their "mutual friends" is Formiae, *Mamurrarum urbs*, connected with the Lamiae and Murena, and possibly the Arrii, as well as with Cicero himself. The inter-action of the ideas and society of the country and the city is one of the themes which runs through the writings and the life of both the Arpinate and the Venusian, devoted as they both were to their second *patria*, Rome. They shared ideals as well as *amici*.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

#### APPENDIX: PEOPLE MENTIONED BY CICERO AND HORACE

This list is not intended to be a full concordance of people mentioned by both Cicero and Horace, but to support generalisations in the main part of the paper about individuals or families with whom both came in contact. They are listed under the name used by Horace.

##### 1. PEOPLE KNOWN TO CICERO AND MENTIONED BY, BUT POSSIBLY NOT PERSONALLY KNOWN TO, HORACE

*Arbuscula* (*Sat.* 1.10.77), a famous *mima*. Cf. *Att.* 4.15.6 (not implying that Cicero knew her off-stage).

*Arrii*: *Quinti progenies Arri*, *par nobile fratrum* (*Sat.* 2.3.243). The father, a *novus homo* who reached the praetorship, was a political "friend" of Cicero (*Vat.* 30, *Mil.* 46) who really did not approve of him (*QF* 1.3.8, *Brut.* 242–243). Cf. *Att.* 1.17.11 (61), 2.5.2, 2.7.3 (59); SB 1.328–329, Wiseman *NMRS* 214, no. 37.

*Evander* (*Sat.* 1.3.91). This may refer to the Arcadian who colonised the Palatine. But if it means the contemporary artist taken by Antony to Alexandria and then brought to Rome as a prisoner, as Acron and Porphyrio say, then he may be the same as the C. Avianius M.l. Evander whom Cicero recommended in 50 (*Fam.* 13.2; cf. a possible reference to him in *Fam.* 7.23.1–2; Treggiari, *RFLR* 136–138).

"*Filius Aesopi*" (*Sat.* 2.3.239) = Clodius. Cf. *Aesopi filius* (*Att.* 11.15.3). He was a friend of Cicero's son-in-law Dolabella, and Cicero found him irritating. Cf. SB 5.285–286.

<sup>59</sup>Cf. Wiseman, *NMRS* 47–52 and Appendix 3; John H. d'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples. A social and cultural study of the villas and their owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400* (Cambridge, Mass. 1970).

*Fufidius* (*Sat.* 1.2.12), a rich miser. He may be the same as an *eques* known to Cicero, a money-lender who was oppressed by Piso (*Pis.* 86). Cicero also knew a Fufidius, probably of Arpinum, from whom he bought a farm in 54 (*QF* 3.1.3) and some of whose property was apparently bequeathed to him in 47 (*Att.* 11.13.3, 11.14.3, 11.15.4). Possibly this is the same man as the usurer of the speech. Lastly, a M. Fufidius of Arpinum, lately Cicero's *tribunus militum* in Cilicia, was commended to D. Brutus in 46 (*Fam.* 13.11 and 12). Münzer (*RE* 7 [1910] 200–201, no. 1) cautiously followed by, e.g., R. G. M. Nisbet, *Cicero: In L. Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio* (Oxford 1961) 155, identifies Cicero's money-lender and landowner with Horace's rich man.

*Laberius* (*Sat.* 1.10.6), the mime-writer. Cf. *Fam.* 7.11.2 (53), 12.18.2 (46). Neither writer implies that he knew Laberius personally.

*Metella* (*Sat.* 2.3.239) = Caecilia Metella. Cf. *Att.* 11.23.3 (Dolabella's peccadilloes with her, 47), 12.52.2, 13.7.1 (divorced by Spinther, 45); T. P. Wiseman, "The Last of the Metelli," *Latomus* 24 (1965) 52–61, especially 60.

*Tarpa/Maecius* (*Sat.* 1.10.38, *AP* 387) = Sp. Maecius Tarpa, who chose the plays for Pompey's games in 55 (*Fam.* 7.1.1). There is no evidence for personal contact with either writer.

*Villius and Fausta* (*Sat.* 1.2.64). Cicero mentions Sex. Villius in 53 as a friend of Milo, when Villius carried a letter from Cicero to Curio (*Fam.* 2.6.1). Fausta married Milo in 52 after her divorce from Memmius. She is mentioned by Cicero in 51 (*Att.* 5.8.2–3; cf. SB 3.202).

## 2. PEOPLE PROBABLY KNOWN PERSONALLY TO BOTH CICERO AND HORACE

*Bibulus* (*Sat.* 1.10.86) = L. Calpurnius Bibulus (Münzer-Cichorius *RE* 3 [1897] 1367, s.v. Calpurnius [27]), third son of M. Bibulus (*cos.* 59). He was at Athens with young M. Cicero (*Att.* 12.32.2), served under his stepfather Brutus 43–42, died in 32 as praetor designate while governing Syria for Antony. Horace names him as one of the friends and learned men who approved of his work. Bibulus was himself a writer (*Plut. Brutus* 13.2).

*Catius* (*Sat.* 2.4), protagonist, so presumably known to Horace, but arguably no longer alive, since he is rather sharply satirised. Identification is disputed: (a) he is Catius the Insubrian Epicurean (cf. *Fam.* 15.16.1 [45]). Acron, Porphyrio, Wickham 2.160–161, and Carcopino 2.400–401 favour this identification; (b) he is C. Matius, friend of Caesar, Cicero, and Trebatius, who wrote a book on baking. For his friendship with Cicero, see their exchange of letters *Fam.* 11. 27 and 28. This identification is warmly upheld by Palmer 314–316. Rudd 148 is sceptical; (c) a tradition referred to by Acron on line 48 holds that he is an otherwise un-

known Catus Miltiades, author of another book on baking. If (a) or (b) is right, then he was in any case someone known to Cicero. The probability seems to lie with (a).

*Corvinus* (*Odes* 3.21, written for Corvinus, though addressed to a *testa*) = M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (64 B.C.–A.D. 8, *cos.* 31), legate to Brutus 43–42. Cicero mentions him in March, 45, as about to go to Athens as a student, like Bibulus, Acidinus, and young Marcus (*Att.* 12.32.2), and the following year Messalla paid a friendly visit to Cicero and brought a favourable report of his son (*Att.* 15.17.2). He is described in the ode with humorous familiarity and is also mentioned in *Sat.* 1.6.42, 1.10.85 (with other favourable critics, Bibulus, Servius, Pollio, Furnius, etc.), *AP* 370–371. A patron of poets. I do not accept the tale that he became the third husband of Terentia Ciceronis (Jerome *adv. Iovin.* 1.48): perhaps Jerome confuses her with the other ex-wife of Cicero, Publilia. Cf. R. J. Rowland, “Sallust’s wife,” *CW* 62 (1968) 134–135.

*Damasippus* (*Sat.* 2.3), protagonist. He is presented on a visit to the Sabine farm at the Saturnalia, when he and Horace are made to address each other with rough but not unfriendly criticism (Rudd 173–188). Horace probably really was a friend of Damasippus, but it is arguable that the latter was dead when the satire was published. Acron calls him Junius Damasippus. Cicero mentions a Damasippus from whom he thought of buying *horti* in 45 (*Att.* 12.29.2, 12.33.1), and one dealing in works of art (*Fam.* 7.23.2–3, probably to be dated to the same period, 46 or 45, on which see SB 4.347). These two sets of references are probably to the same man. Wiseman (*NMRS* 80–81) believes this was a Junius Damasippus, retrieving family fortunes lost at the Colline Gate; SB 5.325 regards him as a Licinius Crassus Damasippus, son of a senator who died in Africa fighting under Metellus Scipio. In either case, Horace’s friend is probably the man Cicero mentions. (I would no longer hold to my suggestion [*RFLR* 105, n. 7] that Damasippus could have been a freedman: the name is senatorial, not servile.)

*Furnius* (*Sat.* 1.10.86), a friend and critic. There were two C. Furnii, father and son, both orators. It is not certain which was Horace’s friend. However, I think he should be the tribune of 50, “the eloquent Furnius, in the past an ally and protégé of Cicero, a partisan of Caesar and a legate of Plancus in Gaul” (Syme *RR* 267) and then an Antonian, rather than the son, who would eventually be consul in 17. The elder Furnius had been well-disposed to Cicero in 50 (references in *MRR* 2.249) and was at least a political *amicus* in 43, frequently mentioned in the correspondence with Plancus (*Fam.* 10.1–24) and himself the recipient of two encouraging letters from Cicero (*Fam.* 10.25 and 26). See TP 6.c–cii, Kappelmacher *RE* 7 (1910) 375–377, s.v. Furnius (3 and 4); Wiseman, *NMRS* 233, no. 190.



*Plancus* (*Odes* 1.7) = L. Munatius Plancus *cos.* 42, correspondent of Cicero (*Fam.* 10.1–24, cf. TP 6.lxxvi–lxxxiv).

*Pollio* (*Sat.* 1.10.85, *Odes* 2.1 addressee) = C. Asinius Pollio *cos.* 40. Cf. *Fam.* 1.6.1 (56), *Att.* 12.38.2 and 39.1 (45); letters from Pollio: *Fam.* 10.31, 32, and 33 (43).

*Servius* (*Sat.* 1.10.86) is probably the son of the jurist, Servius Sulpicius Rufus (unless, as is assumed *e silentio*, the younger Sulpicius had died in the proscriptions; cf. SB 3.196). The son, born about 80, since he apparently helped his father prosecute Murena in 63 (*Mur.* 56; cf. 54) was well known to Cicero, who considered him as a third husband for Tullia (*Att.* 5.4.1 [51]; cf. 5.21.14, 6.1.10 [50]), remained on friendly terms with him (*Att.* 10.10.4, *Fam.* 4.2.1 [49]) and wrote to his father in 46, *Ego cum tuo Servio iucundissime et coniunctissime vivo magnamque cum ex ingenio eius singularique studio tum ex virtute et probitate voluptatem capio* (*Fam.* 13.27.4). (Cf. Münzer *RE* 4A [1931] 860–862, s.v. Sulpicius [96].)

*Sestius* (*Odes* 1.4), addressee. He is clearly L. Sestius (*cos.* 23), son of Cicero's client of 56, P. Sestius. The son is mentioned as *praetextatus* in *Sest.* 144, called *optimus adulescens* in 45 (*Fam.* 13.8.1), and mentioned several times in 44 (*Att.* 15.17.2, 16.4.4, 16.2.4). He was pro-quaestor to Brutus 43–42.

*Tigellius* (*Sat.* 1.2.1 ff., 1.3.1 ff.). As Caesar's protégé, he had borne a grudge against Cicero (*Fam.* 8.24, *Att.* 13. 49 and 51 [45]).

*Torquatus* (*Epp.* 1.5, *Odes* 4.7), addressee. He may be the same as Acidinus (*Att.* 12.32.2 with SB 5.326), who was expected to be studying in Athens with young M. Cicero. If so, Torquatus is yet another of the friends from the old days in Athens of whom Horace was so tenacious.

*Trebatius* (*Sat.* 2.1), addressee. Cf. *Fam.* 7.5.1–2 (recommended to Caesar), 7.6–22 (to Trebatius). Cf. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 145–147.