

XII. "O fortunatam natam . . ."

WALTER ALLEN, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Of Cicero's poetry even the professional scholar is apt to know little more than

O fortunatam natam me consule Romam,

unless he happens to recollect also the line which begins *Cedant arma togae*. While these notorious verses have blighted Cicero's poetical reputation,¹ one can find himself in some difficulty if he is asked to specify why he finds *O fortunatam natam* amusing, or whether indeed it should be considered entertaining. Until recently the present writer was in no better case, and his decision to seek further enlightenment is due to the brief but provocative articles of several Italian scholars² who have engaged in a controversy which has gone relatively unnoticed in the United States. No definitive, nor necessarily consistent, conclusions will ever be possible, but much is to be learned of classical literary principles and techniques through a careful investigation of this single verse.³

One important difference between modern and Roman literary criticism is that the ancient writer sometimes devoted himself to the appraisal of single verses where we might attempt criticism of entire poems. When Cicero was writing of Caesar as a connoisseur of Ciceronian humor, he added (*Fam.* 9.16.4): "ut Servius, frater tuus, quem litteratissimum fuisse iudico, facile diceret: 'Hic versus Plauti non est, hic est,' quod tritas auris haberet notandis generibus poe-

¹ G. A. Harrer, "Some Verses of Cicero," *Stud. in Philol.* 25 (1928) 70, 91; J. W. Spaeth, Jr., "Cicero the Poet," *CJ* 26 (1930/31) 511 f.; A. Traglia, *La lingua di Cicerone poeta* (Bari 1950) 43-45.

² Notably C. Pascal, "Un verso di Cicerone," *Athenaeum* 4 (1916) 309-11 (reprinted, with an added footnote on the resemblance to Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.256, in C. Pascal, *Scritti varii di letteratura latina* [Turin 1920] 105-7); M. Galdi, "Per un verso di Cicerone," *Riv. Indo-Greco-Italica* 6, 1-2 (1922) 62-64; G. Pasquali, "Un verso oraziano, Cicerone ed Ennio," *SI Ital* N. S. 24 (1950) 127 f.; cf. G. P. (i.e., Pasquali), *Atene e Roma* 19 (1916) 212. In this respect I have received little specific help from E. Malcovati, "Cicerone e la poesia," *Annali d. facoltà di lettere e di filosofia d. Univ. di Cagliari*, 13 (Pavia 1943) 254-64.

³ These two verses were the object of debate among the Humanists too: E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*² (Leipzig and Berlin 1909) 2.891, note 1.

tarum et consuetudine legendi." According to Gellius 3.3.6, Favorinus declared a single verse could determine whether a play was Plautine.⁴ And of course there is Horace's famous dictum in *Sat.* 1.4.62 about *disiecti membra poetae*. The Elder Seneca relates in *Controv.* 2.2(10).12 the anecdote that Ovid was able to anticipate the three verses which his friends selected to expunge from his works. N. W. DeWitt made a collection of the small points of objection to, and defense of, Vergil's verses;⁵ they refer to content or to precise meanings or to the tone of words or phrases.

The criticism of individual verses could also take more indirect shape, as reminiscences of, or improvements upon, verses of earlier poets by later poets, or of their own verses by some poets.⁶ Lucilius wrote thus (410 Warmington; 347 Marx) of the person who criticized Homer:

versum unum culpat, verbum, enthyrema, locumve;

and Servius on *Aen.* 11.601 refers to a verse of Ennius ridiculed by Lucilius.⁷ Quintilian 8.6.17 and Ps.-Acro quote Furius Bibaculus' verse as

Iuppiter hibernas cana nive conspuat Alpes,

which in Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.41 reads

Furius hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpīs.⁸

One would expect to find more examples of parody than actually seem to be the case, especially as, in the much later Hermogenes, *Meth.* 30 is labelled *Περὶ χρήσεως ἐπῶν ἐν περὶ λόγῳ*. He there, with examples from Aeschines and Demosthenes, describes the two methods of *kollêsis* and *parôdia*. We shall have occasion again later to refer to Cicero *De or.* 2.257: "Saepe etiam versus facete interponitur, vel ut est vel paululum immutatus, aut aliqua pars versus."

A larger example of parody is of course *Catal.* 10, the adaptation of Catullus 4 for comic purposes, but not necessarily intended to

⁴ See E. H. Clift, *Latin "Pseudepigrapha"* (Baltimore 1945) 60 f.

⁵ "Vergil's Detractors," *CJ* 25 (1929/30) 662-70; see also O. Ribbeck, *Prolegomena Critica ad P. Vergili Maronis Opera Maiora* (Leipzig 1866; vol. 5 of his edition of Vergil) chap. 8: "De obtrectatoribus Vergilii et de Q. Asconio Pediano."

⁶ W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart 1924) 170-72, for general comments on this practice; for specific examples cf. G. Highet, "Juvenal's Bookcase," *AJP* 72 (1951) 369-94.

⁷ Cf. J. F. D'Alton, *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism* (London 1931) 48.

⁸ See J. W. Spaeth, Jr., "Caesar's Friends and Enemies Among the Poets," *CJ* 32 (1936/37) 551 f.

make fun of Catullus' poem. Numitorius (?),⁹ on the other hand, wrote parodies of two of Vergil's *Eclogues* under the title *Antibucolica*. His parody of *Eclogue* I began

Tityre, si toga calda tibi est, quo tegmine fagi?

and the parody of *Eclogue* III began

Dic mihi, Damoeta, 'cuium pecus' anne Latinum?
Non; verum Aegonis nostri sic rure locuntur.

Servius (*Buc.* 2.23) reports that a Vergiliomastix deliberately mis-punctuated *Ecl.* 2.22:

lac mihi non aestate novum, non frigore: defit,

while Donatus, confirmed by Servius, reports: "alius recitante eo ex georgicis (I, 299): 'nudus ara, sere nudus' subiecit: 'habebis frigore febrem.'"

The Roman tendency to poetical parody lends interest to our problem with *O fortunatam natam*, for this verse is one of three selections of Cicero's poetry, all from *De consulatu suo*,¹⁰ which were widely derided. Since the other two were subjected to parody, it would seem reasonable to consider whether that was not also the

⁹ For the Vergilian parodies discussed in this paragraph see: M. Schanz—C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 2.96–98; Donatus 10, 170–79 (in the Teubner *Vitae Vergilianae*, ed. Brummer, 1933).

¹⁰ I wish to refer only in passing to the mistaken thesis of E. Heikel that *De consulatu suo* and *De temporibus suis* are not two distinct works: "Adversaria ad Ciceronis De Consulatu suo poema," *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae* Ser. B, Tom. VII, no. 4 (Helsinki 1913) esp. 18–46. This unfortunate hypothesis compelled Heikel (37 f., 40 f.) to theorize that the occurrence of *Cedant arma togae* in *Pis.* 72 ff. (55 B.C.) was to be explained by Piso's learning of the verse privately from the *De consulatu* section of the poem before this combined poem was made public.

Koch believed that *De consulatu suo*, finished in 60, was published a little before the date of *In Pisonem* (13–16, 69, in Koch), and that *De temporibus suis* was the source of the *concilium deorum-custos* and Jupiter-Minerva-Italy passages from Ps.-Sall. *In Cic.* which we shall discuss: E. Koch, *Ciceronis carmina historica restituta atque enarrata* (Greifswald 1922) 51–55. Koch also failed to observe (15 f.) that *Dom.* 92 (57 B.C.) refers to *De consulatu suo*.

The two poems are adequately separated by Cicero's writing of the third book of *De consulatu suo* in *Att.* 2.3.4, and of three books of *De temporibus suis* in *Fam.* 1.9.23. Traglia (above, note 1) 45 f., agrees that *De temporibus suis* was a separate poem.

For a general survey of the problems and scholarship relative to these two poems, see K. Büchner, *RE* s.v. M. Tullius Cicero (Fragmente), 1245–53, where it can be observed that the decisions to assign some material to one or the other of the poems have resembled an article of faith, with consequent disagreements. As we proceed, I shall try to justify my opinions where they are pertinent.

fate of this verse. In the case of the other two selections, moreover, the parodies became better known than the true Ciceronian versions.

Recent discussions maintain,¹¹ with complete probability, that Cicero's version of the first of these three selections was

Cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi,

and that final *linguae* in place of *laudi* was a substitution devised by his enemies.¹² In his defense of the verse in *Pis.* 72-76, and in *Off.* 1.77 f. (in the better MSS), Cicero gives the verse in full and himself uses *laudi*. The parody may have come into existence after Cicero's death, for Cicero defended the verse, in *Phil.* 2.20 as well as in the two passages where he cited it in full, against the charge of inaccuracy and vain exaggeration, but not against the word *linguae*.¹³ Were it not for Cicero, however, *linguae* would today be the accepted reading, for it is given by Ps.-Sall. *In Cic.* 3.6, Quintil. 11.1.24, and it is reflected by *Laus Pisonis* 35 f., Plin. *HN* 7.117, Plut. *Comp. Dem. & Cic.* 2.1,¹⁴ although the *Laus Pisonis* and the Elder Pliny have the obvious intention of praising Cicero.¹⁵ The version first given by Ps.-Sall. won the day even with such a Ciceronian as Quintilian!

The success of *Cedant arma togae* as a point with which to attack Cicero depended in his own time rather upon the suggestion that Cicero was claiming that his consulship outshone Pompey's military feats.¹⁶ In *Pis.* 72-76, Cicero carefully explained that he had written in general terms and not with specific reference to one *imperator* who

¹¹ E. V. Marmorale, "Sul testo di un verso di Cicerone (*F.P.L.* 10 Baehrens, 16 Morel)," *RFIC* N.S. 25 (1947) 118-20; Traglia (above, note 1) 231 f. Marmorale finds that the verse is a reminiscence of Plaut. *Cist.* 201, in the prologue by Auxilium:

perdite perduelles, parite laudem et lauream.

¹² It seems to me pure fantasy to suggest that Cicero originally wrote *linguae*, which he later altered to *laudi*: Heikel (above, note 10) 67.

¹³ Harrer (above, note 1) 83 f. Yet it has also been noted that *Cedant arma togae* was at times more gently handled than was *O fortunatam natam*: J. W. Spaeth, Jr., "Cedant Arma Togae," *CJ* 31 (1935/36) 442, who also adds the possible reflection of the verse in Ovid *Am.* 1.15.33 f.

¹⁴ The passage from Plutarch is somewhat puzzling since he implies that Cicero was guilty of this statement ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, which would be in some sort of prose.

¹⁵ P. W. Harsh, "The Role of the Ghost of Cicero in the Damnation of Antony," *CW* 47 (1953/54) 97-103, considers that Cicero "was a hero and a martyr in less than ten years after his death." There was a group which remained inimical to Cicero posthumously: Th. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*³ (Leipzig & Berlin 1912) 11-15; P. Petzold, *De Ciceronis obrectatoribus et laudatoribus Romanis*: Pars I (Leipzig 1911) 63-71.

¹⁶ Cf. Pompey's attitude in *Schol. Bob.* on *Planc.* 85 (p. 167, ed. Stangl).

was also a dear friend. Cicero in *Phil.* 2.20 insisted on the accuracy of his statement in the verse. He maintained in *Off.* 1.77 f. that the verse was no greater than the simple truth, and that Pompey had openly expressed gratitude to Cicero that the city remained in which he could hold his third triumph, a sentiment occurring also in *Phil.* 2.12.¹⁷ Cicero continued to find nothing objectionable in the verse, for in June of 43 C. Cassius used it to flatter Cicero (*Fam.* 12.13.1): "Cum rei p. vel salute vel victoria gaudemus tum instauratione tuarum laudum. . . . Est enim tua toga omnium armis felicior; quae nunc quoque nobis paene victam rem p. ex manibus hostium eripuit ac reddidit."¹⁸ No sign of *linguae* at all.

The second instance of a comic use of Cicero's poetry deserves our attention, although it is not a verse parody. I take it to be a mockery of an unknown passage in Cicero's *De consulatu suo* when Clodius made a remark which Cicero repeated thus in *Dom.* 92 (57 B.C.): "Hic tu me etiam gloriari vetas; negas esse ferenda quae soleam de me praedicare, et homo facetus inducis etiam sermonem urbanum ac venustum, me dicere solere esse me Iovem, eundemque dictitare Minervam esse sororem meam."¹⁹ The joke raises a number of problems which I shall try to solve in another paper; at this time it is enough to assert that we have here another deliberate parody, in this case in prose, of one of Cicero's poetical flights.

It seems possible that this passage in *Dom.* 92 bears some relation to Ps.-Sall. *In Cic.* 2.3: "Atque haec cum ita sint, tamen se Cicero

¹⁷ In his school edition of the *De officiis* (Leipzig 1882) C. F. W. Müller compared *Fam.* 15.6.1 (to Cato): "Et si non modo omnes verum etiam multi Catones essent in civitate nostra, . . . quem ego currum aut quam lauream cum tua laudatione conferrem?"

¹⁸ The comment by Tyrrell and Purser on this passage in their edition (6².278) is that it was "the regular compliment to be paid Cicero." Cf. also Cicero's own remarks about the *supplicatio* which was voted in the name of Cicero *togatus* in *Cat.* 3.15, 4.5.

¹⁹ I agree with R. G. Nisbet on *Dom.* 92 in his edition of the oration (Oxford 1939) that this passage calls to mind *De consulatu suo*. I should even declare that *Dom.* 92 constitutes evidence for the publication of the poem before Cicero's exile, just as *Att.* 2.3.4 is evidence of its completion in 60 B.C. Unless one should speculate that the poem was published in the month of September after Cicero's return to Rome and before the time of that speech!

Harrer (above, note 1) 89 f., note 103, properly rejects the view of H. Jordan, "Die Invectiven des Sallust und Cicero," *Hermes* 11 (1876) 314-18, that the clauses in the invective about Jupiter and Minerva are from some prose work and that Quintilian was in error in regarding them as verse. This passage, which will presently be cited in my text, and *Dom.* 92, and also Quintilian's reference to Jupiter and Minerva in 11.1.24, all had their origin in *De consulatu suo*, according to P. Petzold (above, note 15) 19, 47 f.

dicit in concilio deorum immortalium fuisse, inde missum huic urbi civibusque custodem. . . ." It seems certain that it bears some relation to Ps.-Sall. *In Cic.* 4.7: ". . . quem Minerva omnis artis edocuit,²⁰ Iuppiter Optimus Maximus in concilio deorum admisit, Italia exulem humeris suis reportavit."²¹ Quintilian, who, it has often been observed, appears to have known about Cicero's poetry principally through Ps.-Sall.,²² wrote in 11.1.24:

In carminibus utinam pepercisset, quae non desierunt carpere maligni:

Cedant arma togae, concedat laurea linguae;

et

O fortunatam natam me consule Romam;

et "Iovem illum, a quo in concilium deorum advocatur" et "Minervam, quae artes eum edocuit," quae sibi ille secutus quaedam Graecorum exempla permiserat.

Once more it was the mockery which gained wider currency than the original verses, which in this instance are unknown because Cicero chose not to quote them in *Dom.* 92.

With this background we shall perhaps be more inclined to comprehend the reasoning of the scholars who have introduced the notion of rewriting *O fortunatam natam*. I fear that their attempts, though they merit our attention, were quite mistaken,²³ and I shall later show that we must cope with the verse as it stands or that we should at least not undertake radical alteration.

No doubt the idea of changing the verse rests upon the admonition of Quintilian (9.4.41, as the text is often amended to read):

²⁰ Apparently no one has noted the verbal parallel in Verg. *Aen.* 5.704 f.:

tum senior Nautes, unum Tritonia Pallas
quem docuit multaque insignem reddidit arte.

²¹ This last clause about Cicero's return from exile could not have reference to *De consulatu suo*, of course, and I doubt that it comes from *De temporibus suis*. There are close parallels to the phrasing of the clause in Cic. *Red. sen.* 39 (cf. 28), Plut. *Cic.* 33.5; and it may be significant that Quintilian does not include it among the verses in 11.1.24.

²² Heikel (above, note 10) 7 f.; Harrer (above, note 1) 88-90. T. Peck, "Cicero's Hexameters," *TAPA* 28 (1897) 73, comments that Quintilian, in addition to these two verses, quotes only an elegiac couplet found in *quodam ioculari libello* (8.6.73).

²³ One small preliminary matter: Harrer (above, note 1) 85, points out that it was not unusual in Latin hexameters to have a line beginning with *O* and some form of *fortunatus*; but the nominative seems at least as general as the accusative in Latin after *O*: A. Ernout—F. Thomas, *Syntaxe latine*² (Paris 1953) 11, 23 f.

Videndum etiam ne syllabae verbi prioris ultimae sint primae sequentis. Id ne quis praecipi miretur, Ciceroni in epistulis excidit: "Res mihi invisae visae sunt, Brute," et in carmine:

O fortunatam natam me consule Romam.

The substance of this precept is repeated in Diomedes (I, pp. 465 f., ed. Keil).²⁴

G. Pascoli,²⁵ who was both poet and Classicist, thought that the verse could have read

O fortunatam, Tulli, te consule Romam!

and that it was addressed to Cicero in *De consulatu suo* by some divine personage (Calliope, Urania, or Jupiter). C. Pascal (above, note 2) makes out a good case for the possibility that Cicero wrote only

— uu. O fortunatam me consule Romam!

and that the verse was filled out in some other way than by *natam*. His reasoning was that Ps.-Sall. *In Cic.* 3.5 quotes the verse in full with the *natam*, but that Ps.-Cic. *In Sall.* 2.7 has only *fortunatam me consule Romam*. Then, wrote Pascal, Quintilian copied Ps.-Sall. *In Cic.*, as did Juv. 10.122; and Diomedes (I, p. 466, 1, ed. Keil) was simply following in the then established tradition. There is no evidence contemporary with Cicero for the verse as it is usually quoted.

The proper approach thus becomes the effort to understand the classical standards of poetry in the Ciceronian Period.²⁶ Merely to study the ancient comments about poetry is not enough, for we still have much to learn about euphony, cacophony, and dissonance among the Latin poets in actual practice as well as in theory.²⁷

²⁴ There is no significance in the remark by A. Traglia in his edition of *Ciceronis poetica fragmenta* (Rome 1950/52) 1.28, that the *natam* is omitted from the verse in the old MSS of Diomedes, for the anterior comment of Diomedes requires *-natam natam*.

²⁵ *Epos*² (Livorno 1911) 1.68 f. Traglia (above, note 24) 1.8, mentions G. Pascoli, *Epos*⁸ (Livorno 1938) I, pp. LVIII ff., pp. 65 ff., which I have not seen.

²⁶ Harrer (above, note 1) 87 f., sensibly stated that Quintilian judged Cicero's verse in the light of Augustan standards of composition, which of course led Quintilian to condemn Cicero. Harrer overlooked the article by Galdi (above, note 2) and he (pp. 84-87) rejected the suggestions of Pascoli and Pascal.

²⁷ Cf. the excellent works by N. I. Herescu, "Poétique ancienne et moderne au sujet de l'euphonie," *Mélanges Marouzeau* (Paris 1948) 221-47; idem, "L'Assonance latine," *Lettres d'humanité* 5 (1946) 132-48; also J. Marouzeau on cacophony and "paraphony," *Traité de stylistique latine*² (Paris 1946) 41-45.

Since we are certainly justified in taking examples from prose as well as poetry, we should note, in addition to the *invisae visae* mentioned by Quintilian (9.4.41), several parallels given by J. E. B. Mayor in the notes on 10.122 f. in his edition of Juvenal (vol. 2, reprinted 1900): Cic. *De or.* 1.2 *moles molestiarum*, *Brut.* 221 *acer acerbus*, *Off.* 1.61 *pleniore ore*, Ter. *Eun.* 236 *pannis annisque*,²⁸ all of which could be called homophony on more than one syllable.²⁹ M. Galdi also found similar assonances elsewhere in Cicero,³⁰ as *eo equo quo* in Cic. *Amic.* 68 (which is not in the usual text); and Harrer observed that jingles were acceptable in both Ennian and Ciceronian verse.³¹ We can hardly, therefore, regard it as unique that Cicero should have written *-natam natam*.

Because the modern ear may be offended by *-natam . . . Romam* as much as by *-natam natam*, a few remarks are in order upon the question of Latin rhyme.³² *O fortunatam natam* is actually but one of a

²⁸ Mayor refers to A. F. Naekius, "De allitteratione sermonis latini," *RhM* 3 (1829) 324–418, of which section IV on homoeoteleuton is on pp. 388–401. On p. 399 Näke insisted that Cicero liked the sound of *-natam natam*.

²⁹ Marouzeau (above note 27) 52–58.

³⁰ Galdi (above, note 2) also thought that Quintilian's authority in 9.4.41 and 11.1.24 proves that Cicero wrote the verse as we have it. Galdi maintains that the verse, which paraphrases the meaning of *pater patriae*, is Ciceronian in technique as it stands.

A. Traglia also published a short article on this point, with a few remarks which he largely incorporated into his book (above, note 1): "Due versi malfamati di Cicerone," *Idea; settimanale di cultura* (Supplemento di *Idea; mensile di cultura politica e sociale*) 1, 31 (Dec. 11, 1949) pp. 2 and 6. He contradicts Pascoli and points out that Cicero doubtless thought the second *natam* was particularly fine, a resumption after the caesura. He added the comparison with Lucretius 5.1334: *domi domitos*; and with Ennius (47 Valm.):

astu, non vi sum summam servare decet rem.

These points are developed by Traglia (above, note 1) 230, this time quoting Ennius in Vahlen's text:

at tu non ut sum summam servare decet rem (*Ann.* 98).

³¹ Harrer (above, note 1) 85–87. O. J. Todd made a collection of Ciceronian and other prose jingles, with the comment that the ancients "may not have been quite as sensitive as we are to repetition of sound," in his "Sense and Sound in Classical Poetry," *CQ* 36 (1942) 30 f. J. C. Rolfe believed that Cicero wrote this verse deliberately, "Cicero's Hexameters," *CJ* 13 (1917/18) 688.

³² There is the initial problem of terminology, of whether the sort of assonance which occurs in Latin within a single verse or among several verses is to be defined as rhyme. I see no objection to calling it rhyme, nor to calling *O fortunatam natam* a Leonine verse, so long as we understand that we are employing modern terms for approximately similar devices which have no Latin name. We should note that E. Norden (above, note 3) Anhang I: "Über die Geschichte des Reims," 830 f., 839–41, 867–70, 889–93, did not favor the idea of classical Latin rhyme, preferring to term it rhetorical

number of verses exhibiting Cicero's use of Leonine verses,³³ and in some instances Cicero's successive verses rhyme at their close. It can be maintained that the full version of *O fortunatam natam* is correct just because Cicero was so fond of alliteration, assonance, and homoeoteleuton in the archaic style.³⁴ I agree that rhyme is symmetrical homoeoteleuton, and that Cicero employed this sort of rhyme in prose and poetry.³⁵ It would thus appear that *O fortunatam natam* is rhetorically overburdened, for it has homophony on more than one syllable in *-natam natam*, it is a Leonine verse because of the homoeoteleuton between *-natam* and *Romam*, and we should properly speak of homoeoptoton because all three words have identical case endings.³⁶

The Augustan poets are similarly rhetorical, although not to the same extreme. Horace has Leonine rhymes, as in *Carm.* 1.1.5-7, *Sat.* 1.6.10 f., *Ars P.* 152, 344;³⁷ and Propertius was addicted to rhyme and verbal artificialities.³⁸ Even Vergil was not exempt, for he wrote *sede sedens* as the beginning of *Aen.* 7.193, *o fama ingens, ingentior armis* as the latter portion of *Aen.* 11.124, *Evandrum*

ornament and to label it homoioteleuton. W. W. Ewbank, *The Poems of Cicero* (London 1933) on 67 f., rejected the suggestion of intentional and artistic rhyme between the middle and the end of a verse, pointing out, as is perfectly true, that the cause of the rhyme often arises from the structure which places the adjective in the middle, and the noun at the end, of the verse; on 119 he wrote that "Cicero had no compunction in employing rhyme between the first and second half of a verse."

³³ Peck (above, note 22) 69 f.

³⁴ Traglia (above, note 1) 35, 228-30. Traglia (above, note 30) suggested that the five spondees were meant to convey a religious gravity; cf. Traglia (above, note 1) 230.

³⁵ Marouzeau (above, note 27) 58-65.

³⁶ *Rhet. Her.* 4.20.28, with the caution in 4.12.18 against continuous homoeoptoton, as in

Flentes, plorantes, lacrimantes, obtestantes.

In the course of the discussion of *Cedant arma togae* and *O fortunatam natam* in W. Dru-mann—P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* (Leipzig 1899-1929) 5.598, there is in note 12 the pertinent quotation of *De or.* 3.206: "et geminatio verborum habet interdum vim . . . et illa, quae similiter desinunt aut quae cadunt similiter etc.," with the citation also of *Cat.* 1.26: "tuam illam praeclaram patientiam"; *Mur.* 21: "operarum harum cotidiana-rum." Quintilian, on the other hand, writes in 9.4.42, in the section following the one in which he disapproved of *-natam natam*: "Illa quoque vitia sunt eiusdem loci, si cadentia similiter et similiter desinentia et eodem modo declinata multa iunguntur."

³⁷ J. Marouzeau, *Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire* (Paris 1949) 198 f., 211.

³⁸ B. O. Foster, "On Certain Euphonic Embellishments in the Verse of Propertius," *TAPA* 40 (1909) 31-62. Cf. A. Biese, "De iteratis syllabis observatiuncula," *RhM* 38 (1883) 634-37.

Evandrique domos in *Aen.* 11.140,³⁹ and *Aen.* 10.360 f. reads:

haud aliter Troianae acies aciesque Latinae
concurrunt, haeret pede pes densusque viro vir,

which last may be an imitation or reminiscence (cf. Conington *ad loc.*). Although these Vergilian examples are not precisely similar to *O fortunatam natam*, I question whether they, when scanned aloud, are much more satisfactory to the modern ear.

Now that we have decided that *O fortunatam natam* may be overly rhetorical⁴⁰ but that as poetry it was not strange enough to have evoked centuries of mirth, it is of value to try to establish whether the source of amusement lay in the content of the verse. While Cicero felt compelled several times to defend *Cedant arma togae*, he nowhere cites or defends *O fortunatam natam*,⁴¹ a fact which might well suggest that the verse was not attacked in his lifetime. The only possible Ciceronian allusion to the verse is in *Flac.* 102, in which Cicero proudly proclaimed in the year after the completion of *De consulatu suo*:⁴² "O Nonae illae Decembres quae me consule fuistis! quem ego diem vere natalem huius urbis aut certe salutarem appellare possum." This passage, even if we were sure that it is more than a coincidence, still would not prove whether or not *O fortunatam natam* was derided in the course of Cicero's lifetime, for Cicero still spoke proudly of *Cedant arma togae* when that verse was attacked for its content.

Was it perhaps that the ancients were distressed by the excessive vanity⁴³ of *O fortunatam natam*? When they mention the verse,

³⁹ Similar to the type of paronomasia called polyptoton in *Rhet. Her.* 4.22.30 f. in the Loeb edition of H. Caplan.

⁴⁰ Norden (above, note 3) 2.890 f., commented without elaboration that it is too rhetorical, as have other scholars.

⁴¹ Harrer (above, note 1) 84. This of course leaves out of consideration Ps.-Sall. *In Cic.* and Ps.-Cic. *In Sall.*, for it seems to me impossible to decide with conviction the authorship of either of those two pamphlets. The most convenient review of the problem is by E. H. Clift (above, note 4) 92-98, who accepts the Sallustian authorship and rejects the Ciceronian.

⁴² I agree with Harrer (above, note 1) 71, and note 8, that *De consulatu suo* was completed in 60 (*Att.* 2.3.4) and that *De temporibus suis* was completed in 54 (*Fam.* 1.9.23).

⁴³ Cf. W. Allen, Jr., "Cicero's Conceit," *TAPA* 85 (1954) 121-44, for indications that Cicero was not exceptionally vain. Although Quintilian in 11.1.15 f. advised against *iactatio* and in 17-25 discussed strictures of Cicero in this respect, in 11.1.35 f. he wrote: "At vir civilis vereque sapiens, qui se non otiosis disputationibus, sed administrationi rei publicae dedit, a qua longissime isti, qui philosophi vocantur, recesserunt, omnia, quae ad efficiendum oratione quod proposuerit valent, libenter adhib-

that is not the fault they find with it. Quintilian (9.4.41) is in fact the chief authority to specify his objection to the verse, and we have found that to be in the use of *-natam natam*. The most sensible view⁴⁴ is that it became a *locus communis* to malign Cicero's poetry because of a few autobiographical verses from *De consulatu suo*, an attitude which arose among his political adversaries and which endured after Cicero's death (above, note 15). This view is supported by Quintilian 11.1.24: "In carminibus utinam pepercisset, quae non desierunt carpere maligni etc.," which does not, however, clearly state why the *maligni* carped at it. I might add that Quintilian's remark rather carries the implication that these *maligni* were a small group of critics who concentrated their venom on a handful of passages.

According to ancient standards⁴⁵ Cicero was entitled to pride in his great achievement, for he was truly a new Romulus and the Nones of December in 63 were indeed the birthday of Rome preserved. The senate had on December 3 voted in Cicero's name the first *supplicatio* in Rome's history to be awarded for other than military exploits,⁴⁶ and Cicero's expression in the *Catilinarians* (3.1 f., 3.15, 4.5, 4.20 f.) of his pride in the honor is at least as great as that expressed in *O fortunatam natam* and *Cedant arma togae*.

Nor was it a novelty to write an account of one's own consulship. There were the precedents of Aemilius Scaurus, Sulla, Rutilius Rufus, and Lutatius Catulus; and, although Cicero was the first to do so in verse, he was also modest and traditional enough to use the third person.⁴⁷ Nor would the ancient reader necessarily have been

ebit, cum prius, quid honestum sit efficere, in animo suo constituerit. Est quod principes deceat, aliis non concesseris. Imperatorum ac triumphalium separata est aliqua ex parte ratio eloquentiae, sicut Pompeius abunde disertus rerum suarum narrator, et hic, qui bello civili se interfecit, Cato eloquens senator fuit."

⁴⁴ Traglia (above, note 1) 43-45; cf. Ewbank (above, note 32) 27-32.

⁴⁵ For a fine collection of passages cf. A. Alföldi, "Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik: 2. Der neue Romulus; 3. Parens patriae," *MusHelv* 8 (1951) 190-215, 9 (1952) 204-43, 10 (1953) 103-24, 11 (1954) 133-69, although Alföldi's interpretations are unfriendly to Cicero. Traglia (above, note 30) observed that Cicero was claiming to be a second Romulus, and that Cicero's enemies were trying to ridicule his achievements; cf. Traglia (above, note 1) 45.

⁴⁶ For a collection of passages about Cicero's *supplicatio* and his appellation as *parens patriae* see also Drumann-Groebe (above, note 36) 5.512 f., 542 f. In the *Third Catilinarian* Cicero stressed the importance of Dec. 3, but later he came to feel that the more important date was Dec. 5, to which this verse alludes: E. Koch (above, note 10) 41 f.; cf. *Att.* 1.19.6, *Flac.* 102.

⁴⁷ K. Büchner (above, note 10) 1248 f. G. Misch is of general value for background: *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1951) 1.208-30:

surprised by historical material in verse, for sometimes history was thought to be close to poetry in style.⁴⁸

Our last line of inquiry is whether *O fortunatam natam* was seriously reflected or adapted in the last century B.C. Since Cicero is thought to have been esteemed as a poet before the advent of Lucretius, Catullus, and the Augustans,⁴⁹ we should expect to derive some helpful comment from them in the way of literary compliment through quotation of, or reminiscences of, Ciceronian verses.⁵⁰ It is disappointing not to be able to demonstrate clear influence of Cicero on several poets⁵¹ since such a demonstration would assist in the question of the influence on Horace of *O fortunatam natam*. The Horatian verse in question is from his *Epistle to Augustus* (*Epist.* 2.1.256):

Et formidatam Parthis te principe Romam.

The more recent history of the problem begins with M. T. Tatham, who published the plain query of whether anyone else had noted the resemblance between *O fortunatam natam* and Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.256.⁵² The resemblance had, unknown to Tatham, previously been commented upon by Pascal (above, note 2), who thought it supported his thesis that Cicero had written simply

— uu. O fortunatam me consule Romam!

"Aristocratic Families of the Roman Republic"; 1.231-55: "Roman Statesmen before Augustus." Büchner's remark gives Misch credit for seeing that the poem was in the third person.

⁴⁸ Quintil. 10.1.31 (about history): "Est enim proxima poetis et quodam modo carmen solutum"; Norden (above, note 3) 1.91-95. Misch (above, note 47) 1.250, mentions an epic on Pompey, and I have discussed some epics on Caesar in "The British Epics of Quintus and Marcus Cicero," *TAPA* 86 (1955) 143-59.

⁴⁹ E.g., J. W. Spaeth, Jr. (above, note 1) 500-12; E. J. Wood's brief summary is so good that it is a pity he has not published the full paper: "Cicero, Poet and Critic of Poetry," *Proc. Class. Ass.* 50 (1953) 28. Cf. also Büchner (above, note 10) 1266 f. for an evaluation of Cicero as a poet.

⁵⁰ Kroll (above, note 6) *loc. cit.*

⁵¹ We cannot be certain that Lucretius imitated Cicero, although Traglia (above, note 1) *passim*, has some persuasive remarks on the influence of Cicero on Lucretius and Vergil. A. Fellin is perhaps extreme in his efforts to be specific in "Risonanze del De consulatu ciceroniano nel poema di Lucrezio," *RFIC* N.S. 29 (1951) 307-16.

W. H. Alexander, "Versificator Quam Poeta Melior?" *CJ* 41 (1945/46) 219, took exception to a remark by O. J. Todd in *CJ* 41.68, note 149, and stated that Lucretius imitated Cicero, and then J. W. Spaeth, Jr., in *CJ* 42 (1946/47) 105 f., pointed out, on the basis of W. A. Merrill's studies, that we are not certain that Cicero influenced Lucretius' verse, in particular by his translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena*.

⁵² "An Echo of Cicero in Horace," *CR* 39 (1925) 71.

The resemblance was rediscovered by A. Vegezzi,⁵³ who expressed the opinion that Horace's verse proves that the usual form of the Ciceronian verse is correct since in Horace the word corresponding to *natam* is grammatically connected with the other words in the verse. He went on to state that such would not be the case with the *Tulli* suggested by Pascoli (above, note 25) who, it will be recalled, wished to alter the verse to

O fortunatam, Tulli, te consule Romam!

Vegezzi also found that the Horatian and Ciceronian verses are identical metrically and rhythmically, and he maintained that Horace had the Ciceronian verse in mind.

Since Pasquali (G. P. in my note 2), Pascal, Tatham, Vegezzi, and doubtless many others, have all noted the resemblance between the Ciceronian and the Horatian verses, it scarcely seems prudent to dismiss the resemblance as fortuitous.⁵⁴

G. Pasquali (above, note 2) took still a different tack in 1950 when he insisted that it would have been inappropriate for Horace to use an improvement of a ridiculous verse while he was praising Augustus. Pasquali reaffirmed his earlier stand of 1916, which was attacked by Rasi (above, note 54), that both Cicero and Horace were independently echoing Ennius, although he could not specify the verse of Ennius. Yet the verse of Ennius should be extant if it was so well known. A further objection to Pasquali's thesis is that he does not show the means by which Horace could guarantee that a reader would think of Ennius' verse rather than Cicero's — that a reader would in his mind overleap Cicero and reach back instead to Ennius.

Traglia⁵⁵ thinks that Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.256 was seriously imitating

⁵³ "Cicerone, fr. 17 Morel," *PhW* 56 (1936) 1215 f.; he was roundly rebuked, for not knowing Tatham's note, by G. B. A. Fletcher, *PhW* 57 (1937) 368.

⁵⁴ As does Harrer (above, note 1) 87; cf. P. Rasi, *Atene e Roma* 19 (1916) 253–55, who furthermore thinks poorly of a derivation from Ennius. Certainly it is wise to be aware of the possible resemblance, which escaped L. P. Wilkinson, *Horace & his Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge 1946) 91: "Typically Virgilian is the culminating line of this period with its alliteration and its heavy spondees in the middle,

Et formidatam Parthis te principe Romam,

the extra line that sums up the sense and completes the movement, which Mackail has called the 'overarching superflux.'"

⁵⁵ Traglia (above, note 1) 248 f. I should hesitate to join Traglia (above, note 30) in also finding a reminiscence in Hor. *Carm.* 3.21.1:

O nata mecum consule Manlio,

a theory which is repeated on pp. 248 f. of his book.

the verse of Cicero, and he does not think that they were both following a hypothetical verse of Ennius. I agree, moreover, that Horace did not intend a "revised Ciceronian verse" in the instance of *Epist.* 2.1.256. I should add that Augustus' successful dealings with the Parthians were among the proudest achievements of his reign,⁵⁶ and that the verse had to be unquestionably honorific. In the same epistle Horace himself warned against absurd verses in 262 f.:

discit enim citius meminitque libentius illud,
quod quis deridet, quam quod probat et veneratur.

We could be more certain that the verse is a Ciceronian reminiscence if we could show that Horace imitated Cicero frequently and conspicuously, but the evidence is slight. There are some Ciceronian analogues in Horace's *Odes*;⁵⁷ and it may be correct to discover verbal resemblances as well as similarities in thought between Cicero's *Pro Archia* and Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.223 ff.⁵⁸ W. Wili⁵⁹ noted parallelism of Ciceronian thought to Horatian, and, while he could find no specific connection, he thought that in the *Epistle to Augustus* Horace's praise of poetry (2.1.126–38) is a counterpart to Cicero's hymn to philosophy in *Tusc. disp.* 5.2.5. All this is not very imposing, especially as we know that the *Epistle to Augustus* is full of literary criticism and of literary reminiscences of such authors as Livius Andronicus, Ennius, and Lucilius.⁶⁰

The sum of the matter is that, if we do not adopt the drastic solution of assuming that the resemblance between *O fortunatam natam* and vs. 256 of the *Epistle to Augustus* is accidental, we are forced to the conclusion that in Horace's day no one found the Ciceronian verse objectionable, with the exception of Ps.-Sallust (and depending upon the authorship and date of that invective). We have also been compelled to admit that there is nothing desperately unusual about the style or the content of the verse itself, except insofar as Cicero's political achievements were remarkable, and those it literally describes.

It later became traditional to laugh at *O fortunatam natam*, al-

⁵⁶ H. Furneaux—H. F. Pelham—C. D. Fisher, *The Annals of Tacitus* 22.[100–101].

⁵⁷ E. T. Silk, "Notes on Cicero and the Odes of Horace," *YCS* 13 (1952) 145–58.

⁵⁸ C. Murley, "Cicero, *Pro Archia* and Horace, *Epistles* II, 1, 223 ff.," *CJ* 21 (1925/26) 533 f.

⁵⁹ W. Wili, *Horaz* (Basel 1948) 335–40.

⁶⁰ G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace* (Madison 1920) 440–44.

though without stating clearly why it was amusing, as is shown in the case of Juvenal, who wrote in 10.122–24:

‘O fortunatam natam me consule Romam’:
Antoni gladios potuit contemnere si sic
omnia dixisset. Ridenda poemata etc.

Yet Juvenal was in a way praising Cicero at the same time, for, as is mentioned in the commentary of S. Hart’s edition of Maclean’s *Juvenal* (Boston 1875), Juvenal is reflecting Cic. *Phil.* 2.46.118: “Contempsit Catilinae gladios, non pertimescam tuos.”⁶¹

While I think the sensible course, therefore, is to decide that there was nothing seriously objectionable about the verse and that the tradition of mocking it took form only after Cicero’s death, I wish in conclusion to suggest mildly and tentatively that we might not be far wrong in salvaging a portion of Pascoli’s rewriting:

O fortunatam, Tulli, te consule Romam!

It has, for one thing, the virtue of resembling more closely Horace’s *te principe*, a similarity which Pascoli did not remark upon, and it is the *te consule* which I should like to preserve. While I fully agree with the scholars who believe that Cicero wrote and admired the *-natam natam . . . Romam* which catches the modern eye, it is just possible, I think, that Cicero wrote the whole verse thus:

O fortunatam natam te consule Romam!

As has been pointed out,⁶² *De consulatu suo* was written in the third person. It therefore appears that, if *me consule* is correct, it could have occurred only in a speech made by Cicero within the

⁶¹ If we continue with the quotation from Juvenal, we find that he even gives the reference to the *Second Philippic* in 10.124–6

Ridenda poemata malo
quam te, conspicuae divina Philippica famae,
volveris a prima quae proxima.

Highet (above, note 6) 376, regards Juv. 10.123 f. as a parody of Cic. *Phil.* 2.118, an assertion which seems to me to be weakened by Juv. 10.124–6. And Juvenal admires Cicero in 8.231–44; cf. Highet (above, note 6) 389.

I quote only from Juvenal because he is the only poet to cite the verse. The other ancient judgments on Cicero’s poetry are assembled in Harrer (above, note 1) especially 71–73, Spaeth (above, note 1) 500–12, and Ewbank (above, note 32) 27–29; but even such wit as that of Martial (2.89.3 f.) is not relevant to the present paper because he does not quote the verse.

⁶² Büchner (above, note 10) 1248 f.; the problem is noted also by Koch (above, note 10) 34, 40.

poem. In the other fragments of *De consulatu* Urania uses *te consule* and *consule te* in Book II (11, 61), and in Book III Calliope says to Cicero:

quosque adeo consul virtute animoque petisti.

Sometimes the following verse from *Att.* 2.15.3 is included in the fragments of this poem,⁶³ but without adequate proof:

In montis patrios et ad incunabula nostra.

O fortunatam natam would thus be the only verse in the fragments of *De consulatu suo* to use the first person for Cicero if *me consule* is correct.

According to ancient principles, there would be less cause to charge Cicero with vanity if he did not speak in his own person. Quintilian (11.1.21) says of Cicero in this respect: "In epistulis aliquando familiariter apud amicos, nonnumquam in dialogis aliena tamen persona verum de eloquentia sua dicit."⁶⁴ Pascoli was perceptive in his suggestion that the verse may have been addressed to Cicero by some divinity,⁶⁵ for both Quintilian (11.1.23) and Plutarch (*De laude ipsius* 11) do suggest the avoidance of envy by the ascription of one's greatest deeds to divine guidance, as Cicero did elsewhere.⁶⁶

If there is any value in the hypothesis that Cicero wrote *te consule*, which some wit changed to *me consule*, we are dealing with an instance of paronomasia (*adnominatio*),⁶⁷ a favorite Latin device for which Cic. *De or.* 2.256 supplies the neat example of *Nobiliorem mobiliorem*. In that case the wit would have employed against

⁶³ Traglia (above, note 24) 1.28; Ewbank (above, note 32) 77, 124.

⁶⁴ Quintil. 11.1.22: "Ab aliis ergo laudemur; nam ipsos, ut Demosthenes ait, erubescere, etiam cum ab aliis laudabimur, decet." Cf. Plut. *De laude ipsius* 1, 21. The Teubner Plutarch (vol. 3, ed. M. Pohlenz—W. Sieveking, 1929) refers to the article by L. Radermacher, "Plutarchs Schrift de se ipso citra invidiam laudando," *RhM* 52 (1897) 419–24, which is useful in the present connection for its citation of parallel passages from other authors who treat some of the same material.

⁶⁵ Koch (above, note 10) 85–87, remarked on Cicero's extensive divine machinery.

⁶⁶ W. Allen, Jr. (above, note 43) 142 f.; cf. Hermog. *Meth.* 25 for further discussion of ways for an orator to praise himself without offense.

⁶⁷ Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.21–22.29–31. Caplan, in his Loeb edition of that work, calls attention to the article by Wölfflin to indicate the extent to which the Romans were addicted to play upon words, especially to the change of single letters: "Das Wortspiel im Lateinischen," *SBMünchen* 1887 (2), 187–208. Some reader may also be interested by Wölfflin's comment (p. 201) that Cicero's *invisae visae* and *O fortunatam natam* are pointless, and hence blameworthy. Quintilian's discussion of paronomasia is in 9.3.66–73.

Cicero his own precept, for in *De or.* 2.257 Cicero (i.e., C. Julius Caesar Strabo Vopiscus) recommended: "Saepe etiam versus facete interponitur, vel ut est vel paululum immutatus, aut aliqua pars versus."⁶⁸ Because the other two selections from *De consulatu suo* inspired hilarity only after they were parodied, it is difficult to suppress the *arrière-pensée* that just possibly we are somehow repeating a parody when we quote

O fortunatam natam me consule Romam.

⁶⁸ Harrer (above, note 1) 82, appropriately referred to this passage but with regard to *Cedant arma togae*, in order to explain how *laudi* became *linguae*. We would now have a parallel situation with regard to *O fortunatam natam*.

I see no occasion here to investigate ancient parody as such; that investigation could profitably start with, and work back from, F. J. Lelièvre, "The Basis of Ancient Parody," *Greece and Rome* 2nd ser. 1 (1954) 66-81.