Classical Quarterly 62.2 816–826 (2012) Printed in Great Britain
doi: 10.1017/S000983881200033X

LATE ANTIQUE MEMORIES OF REPUBLICAN POLITICAL POLEMIC: PSEUDO-ACRO *AD* HOR. *SAT.* 2.1.67 AND A *DICTUM MACEDONICI*

At *Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.52–3 Quintilian discusses the *allegoriae* used by orators – and poets – that are so obscure as to become *aenigmata*, instancing the gibes M. Caelius Rufus directed at Clodia Metelli. The solutions to these virtual riddles were known to his generation, but, he informs us, the allusions required interpreters. This was the role of commentators.

It was not only political oratory that required detailed commentary for the benefit of students studying Latinity and the craft. As Quintilian observes, poetry thrived on allusion (which he found annoying). A good deal of prosopographical, historical and topographical data once circulated in the margins of ancient literature, assisting the appreciation of these allusions – such material as was supplied by the second-century Helenius Acro as a companion to Horace's poetry. And Acro was not alone. We hear also of a certain Claranus, a Modestus (both seemingly of the late first century A.D.) and a Q. Terentius Scaurus (of Hadrianic date).[1] In Horace's case, this material was used and in some ways augmented in the third century by Pomponius Porphyrio (though Porphyrio concentrated principally on rhetorical and grammatical matters), and retailed also in the comments of scholiasts that have collectively gone under the header – from the fifteenth century at least – of pseudo-Acro. But there is more; Porphyrio twice refers, in commenting on *Sat.* 1.3, to 'those who wrote on Horatian *personae*'. Do references to those *qui de personis Horatianis scripserunt* allude to one or more of those authors named above, or to a different industry?[2] Sadly, the earliest commentaries have

[1] Horace was established, at least by the late first century A.D., as the object of scholarly attention. See Juvenal's allusion to scholars pawing over by lamplight a discoloured Flaccus (7.226–7). For Claranus, *RE* 3.2627, Modestus (see below), for Q. Terentius Scaurus, *RE* 5A.674–5, and for Acro, *RE* 7.2840. Acro survived to be cited by Charisius. Nor was such material restricted to the early scholiasts alone. Just as numerous items on Virgil surface in Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*, it should not be doubted that so they did in such collections as Suetonius' lost *Prata*. Suetonius' interests are attested. And the later scholiasts accessed a broad range of material.

[2] At 1.3.21 Porphyrio cites these authors as the source for identifying Maenius as one notorious at Rome for his buffoonery and prodigality (*et scurrilitate et nepotatu notissimum Romae*), hardly the basis for a distinguishing identification – but Porphyrio and pseudo-Acro profess to know more about the individual. Porphyrio also cites Lucilius on the same profligate, and goes on to offer an incorrect derivation for the name of the *columna Maenia* ('Hic post patrimonium adrosum kalendis Ianuariis in Capitolio clara uoce optarat, ut quadringenta milia nummorum aeris alieni haberet, et quaerente quodam, quid sibi uellet, quod tam sollemni die aes alienum habere optaret, 'Noli mirari' inquit 'octingenta debeo'. Hic fertur domo sua, quam ad forum spectantem habuerat, diuendita[m] unam columnam inde sibi excepisse, unde gladiatores spectaret, quae ex eo Maeni columna nominabatur. Cuius et Lucilius sic meminit: Maenius columnam cum peteret'), whilst ps.-Acr. *ad Epist.* 1.15.26 offers a prosopographical point on nomenclature ('Maenius hic Pantolabus dictus est ab eo, quod, quicquid offerebatur, acciperet; erat autem et urbanus et mordax. Itaque dabant illi et qui urbanitate delectabantur et qui mordacitatem timebant'). With regard to erroneous explanations of the Column's name, it is worth noting that it was a misunderstanding shared between late antique commentators; cf. [Asc.] *In Divinationem* (§

not survived (and are thus beyond critique) and we are left with Porphyrio and pseudo-Acro. The appreciation of such material preserved is muted. As Schwartz observes: 'the distressing mediocrity of what survives can only make us regret the more the loss [of earlier work]'.[3] Nisbet and Hubbard cast these survivors as 'the inadequate representatives of a long tradition' – and their discussion remains one the best introductions to this subject.[4] Such understandable negativity, however, need not blind us to the benefits remaining. Porphyrio preserved much that would have been lost; pseudo-Acro has picked up items that were not of interest to Porphyrio and which also would otherwise have disappeared.[5]

Before we move to the item with which this article is chiefly concerned, three preliminary items might suffice as examples of what has survived (of the benefits to be derived and the dangers met). The lessons they afford will not be irrelevant. At *Sat*. 1.2.45–6, where Horace has been dilating on the perils of adultery, he surveys the penalties that might be inflicted. Even one's apparatus of pleasure (*testis caudamque salacem*) might be lost to the knife or sword. All agreed, he wrote, that was justice (*'iure' omnes*) – with a sole dissentient (*Galba negabat*). Does Horace allude to a celebrated *ius controversum*? No jurisprudent by the name of Galba is otherwise known. Porphyrio, however, reports (ad loc.) that this was a Servius Galba, a jurisconsult. '[Passion] bound Servius Galba the jurist [or dulled his senses?]; he has responded, almost contrary to self-evident law in favour of adulterers, as if he himself was an adulterer.'[6] Pseudo-Acro (ad loc.) by modest elaboration 'improved' on that: 'Galba, learned in the law (*iuris peritus*), was himself the stalker of married women (*matronarum sectator*), who used to say that the amputation of the testicles was not justly done, since in the first instance the penalty for adultery was pecuniary.' Can anything be made of the scholiasts' contribution? Manfredini suggested that we should see in Horace's allusion Serv. Sulpicius Galba (cos. 144 B.C.), a man who may not have been a jurist but an

50), 210St. At 1.3.90 Porphyrio, with regard to the Evander mentioned there, offers a contentious but quite specific identification with a noted engraver and modeller whom Antony had taken from Athens to Alexandria and who was from there taken back to Rome where fame awaited: 'qui de personis Horatianis scripserunt, aiunt Evandrum hunc caelatorem ac plasten statuarum [quare] M. Antonium ab Athenis Alexandriam transtulisse; inde inter captiuos Romam perductum multa opera mirabilia fecisse.' Many modern readers would prefer the Horatian allusion to be a reference to the mythical Evander; some of those prepared to allow Porphyrio's scholarship take the matter further, witnessing to the powerful temptations of such prosopographical beavering. Evander then would be the noted sculptor C. Avianius Evander, freedman of M. Aemilius Avianianus (Cic. *Fam.* 7.23.1–3; 13.2; Plin. *HN* 36.32).

[3] J. Schwartz, 'L'ombre d'Antoine et les débuts du principat (à propos des commentaires perdus d'Horace)', *MH* (1948), 155–67, at 155.

[4] R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book 1* (Oxford, 1970), xlvii–li. O. Keller's 'Ueber Porphyrion, Pseudoacron and Fulgentius, Scholiasten des Horaz', *Symbola Philologorum Bonnensium in honorem Friderici Ritschelii* 2 (Leipzig, 1867), 489–502, should still be consulted for fuller detail.

[5] By way of example, we point to two fragments of Livy's history preserved in the commentaries (both in Porphyrio and pseudo-Acro) on Hor. *Sat*. 1.5.29 and 1.37.30 (= Liv. 127, frr. 51–3 and 123, fr. 54 Weissenborn, respectively). The examples are illustrative in a number of ways: the references are (relatively) precise; they present material otherwise lost; and, in the case of the former fragment, the commentators reveal a certain thoroughness (having searched what they consider the relevant Livian book), yet also a confusion between two different episodes (diplomatic missions in 40 and 38/7 B.C.). There is also a crucial difference of reportage between Porphyrio and pseudo-Acro. But this last item requires a separate paper.

[6] 'Amare autem Servium Galbam iuris consultum perstrinxit, quasi contra manifestum ius pro adulteris responderit, quia ipse adulter esse.'

extraordinary orator who knew enough law to offer opinions that his clients wanted to hear, and one who argued for equity over the strict letter of the law: *aequitate contra ius* (Cic. *De or*. 1.240).[7] If Horace could allude to Galba's opinion in this fashion, Galba's intervention will have been a cause célèbre (a point of serious discussion and of popular humour – for those to whom the matter was 'academic'). The scholia have assisted this insight (through the partial identification of this Galba), but do not seem to have provided the original data intact. Both Porphyrio and pseudo-Acro have extrapolated (Galba will *not* have offered the *sententia* of a jurisprudent).[8] Moreover, we see the tendency towards what we suspect to have been unacknowledged speculative elaboration, the more so in the case of pseudo-Acro.

The second example is an item clearly attributed by Porphyrio to (the real) Acro. It is the scholium on one of Horace's favourite targets, the frightening Canidia, and her fellow (if auxiliary) Fury, the ever ready and unencumbered Sagana: *expedita Sagana* (Hor. *Epod*. 5.25; cf. *Sat*. 1.8.45: *Furiae … duae*),[9] who operate both behind closed doors and on the desolate dark wastes of the Esquiline cemetery *fuori le mura*.[10] The attacks on these superannuated wannabees, labouring under the delusion that they were effective witches, gain a certain force if it is accepted that these butts of Horace's disapprobation were real women.[11] This is moot, but Porphyrio, commenting on *Epodes* 3.8 had no doubt. 'Canidia' was a Neapolitan *unguentaria* by the name of Gratidia.[12] The name of her offsider, Sagana, was no doubt derived from *saga*, and suggests to Watson that Canidia's accomplice was 'most likely to be pseudonymous or fictitious since … her name is not attested elsewhere and sounds suspiciously like a type-name …'.[13] The name is clearly a pseudonym, but that does not mean that the allusion is not to an historical individual. Porphyrio, in a comment upon *Sat*. 1.8.25, reports that she was: 'I remember reading in Helen(i) us (A)cro that Sagana was the name of a contemporary of Horace, the sorceress (freedwoman?) of a senator <Pompeius/Pomponius>, who was proscribed by the

[7] A.D. Manfredini, 'Galba negabat', in J.W. Cairns and O.F. Robinson (edd.), *Critical Studies in Ancient Law, Comparative Law and Legal History* (Oxford and Portland, 2001), 93–101.

[8] On the clear and important distinction between the *iuris peritus* and the *patronus* (within which category Galba ought more properly to be placed), but also on the considerable overlap between their roles, see R.A. Bauman, *Lawyers in Roman Republican Politics. A Study of the Roman Jurists in their Political Setting, 316–82 BC* (Munich, 1983), 1–2.

[9] Her clothing girt for action, Porphyrio properly explains: 'succinctam videtur dicere'.

[10] Would that the commentator had thought fit to elaborate upon the topography of *Sat*. 1.8. This was before the urban redevelopment soon to overtake much of the Esquiline; cf. C. Buzzetti, 'Esquiliae', in E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* 2 (Rome, 1995), 234–5. On this melancholy spot, see J. Patterson, 'Living and dying in the city of Rome: houses and tombs', in J. Coulston and H. Dodge (edd.), *Ancient Rome. The Archaeology of the Eternal City*. Oxford University School of Archaeology Monograph 54 (Oxford, 2000), 259–89, at 267, and the references cited at 283 n. 75 (but particularly, J. Bodel, 'Graveyards and groves: a study of the Lex Lucerina', *AJAH* 11 [1986], 1–133, at 38–54).

For a discussion of Canidia, embracing earlier scholarship, see the excellent commentary on Epode 5 by L. Watson, *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford, 2003), 174–250, esp. 197–8.

[11] Delusion: see the insightful observations of Watson (n. 10), 186–7; cf. 189–90 on Sagana's laboured pit-digging and on the women's singular lack of success.

[12] Watson (n. 10), 198 believes this should be discounted, arguing that the details are extrapolated from Horace's passing allusions in the poems – without that necessarily establishing her fictionality.

[13] Watson (n. 10), 208 offers a useful discussion of meaningful names.

triumvirs.'[14] It would have been an odd item to fabricate and, if fabricated, would suggest that the scholiasts were quite fanciful in their inventions. Moreover, the circumstantial detail adds weight. Who was Sagana's *patronus*? Sex. Pompeius Magnus Pius would not have been described as 'a senator', so Hinard duly registers a Pompeius, otherwise unattested, in his prosopography of those proscribed in 43.[15] But the name varies in the manuscripts (as Hinard notes). This could be the Pomponius who escaped from Italy by posing as a praetor on official business (App. *B Civ.* 4.45).[16] The dynamics of the Horatian attack are, as we suggested above, considerably affected, if the targets are actual women, and meant to be recognized. A number of observations follow: inter alia, fascinating details arise in Acro's commentary (of interest to historians as well as literary critics); the transmission of Helenius Acro's research may have introduced dubious elements (the woman's name, for instance, was almost certainly *not* Sagana); and (hardly remarkable, but worth noting), the transmission rested on memory.

We are interested here in the scholia within pseudo-Acro, the earliest of which are thought to date from the beginning of the fifth century.[17] A vote of no confidence prevails: most of the work, where not demonstrably based on Porphyrio, has been labelled 'insignificant and insipid'.[18] Yet such a stark distinction between what is found in Porphyrio and what is not does not do justice. The scholiasts preserved material that Porphyrio may have winnowed. The commentator Modestus, probably a contemporary of Martial (10.21.1–2), is cited in the second *vita Horati* (part of pseudo-Acro), a passing indication of the various sources available. Some of us remain hopeful that there are data here not to be dismissed out of hand.[19] Admittedly, modern readers weighing up the worth of any additional material in pseudo-Acro often find themselves on shaky ground, a case in point being

[14] 'memini me legere apud Helen<i>um <A>cronem Saganam nomine fuisse Horati temporibus Pompei sagana (sagam? libertam *coni*. K) senatoris qui a triumviris proscriptus est.' Watson, of course, knows of this item, but puts little store by it.

[15] F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, CEFR 83 (Rome, 1985), 505 [104]. This individual is registered neither in *RE*, nor in H. Klövekorn, *De proscriptionibus a.a.Chr. n. 43 a M. Antonio, M. Aemilio Lepido, C. Iulio Caesare Octaviano triumviris factis* (Regimonti, 1891). (For the latter item, we follow Hinard.) Hinard excludes the possibility that this was Pompeius Varus, the dedicatee of *Carm.* 2.7.

[16] The man was alternatively identified by Valerius Maximus (7.3.9) as Sentius Saturninus Vetulo. It is difficult to believe that two individuals pulled off such a brazen and identical stunt; cf. Hinard (n. 15), 507; cf. 518–19 (on [C.] Sentius Saturninus Vetulo) – with no reference to this item.

[17] They are of a diverse nature, are from more than one hand and were literally marginalia; Keller (n. 4), 499–502; Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 4), xlix.

[18] L. Schwabe (ed.), *Teuffel's History of Roman Literature*, tr. G.C.W. Warr (London, 1900), 374.2 [2.264].

[19] There is no reason, for instance, to doubt that Acro accessed detailed histories, amongst much else. Schwartz (n. 3) argues that Acro used, *inter alios*, Cremutius Cordus. The vestiges of that material in John of Salisbury [A.D. 1189] underline, for Schwartz, the poverty of what remains in pseudo-Acro but prompt the hope of more to be found (167).

H. Usener, 'Vier lateinische Grammatiker', *RhM* 23 (1868), 490–507, at 490–1 believed that, in the glosses of Isidore of Seville, traces of Acro can be discerned, suggesting the survival of his work to that point. Teuffel (n. 18) was of the opinion that the evidence adduced is insufficient to prove the point, and sadly we must agree. But Schwartz (n. 3), 155–6, drawing upon Isidore's access to Servius' Virgilian commentary (and those parallels between John of Salisbury and the later Horatian commentators which point to a common source), reasonably suggests that it would be 'astonishing' if the lost commentaries on Horace had not left traces in the later compilators. Pseudo-Acro refers twice to Acro (in the *Vita* and on *Carm*. 4.9.37).

Linderski's recognition of another Latin word for prostitute in pseudo-Acro's comment on the *fatale monstrum* at Horace, *Odes* 1.37.21 (our third preliminary item).[20] Porphyrio offers alternative interpretations of the word (which play with the fatefulness of Cleopatra's historical role), whilst pseudo-Acro, in a closely parallel entry, adds another: '"fatalem" dixit aut turpem, unde et prostantes fatales dicuntur … aut … aut …').[21] This probably reflects, however, later Latin idiom.[22] Pseudo-Acro's elaboration has been helpful in a way that the scholiast had not intended; late antique contemporary usages have been illuminated rather than Horatian nuances. Yet it is equally clear that pseudo-Acro preserves the odd item of significance not found elsewhere, the consideration of which is certainly not a waste of time.[23]

It is such an item that attracts us here. In *Satires* 1.2, Horace famously defends the licence of satire. He points to the savagery of Lucilius' wit and, in passing, to two of its victims, both *principes* of the day, a Metellus and a Lupus (2.1.61–8).[24] Verse 69 indicates that they were *primores populi*. Pseudo-Acro offers the identities of the two; Lupus was *princeps senatus* (*sc*. L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, cos. 156), Metellus was *Macedonici filius*, that is to say, one of the four sons of Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus (cos. 143, cens. 131/0).[25]

Idest laesi uel irati sunt illi duo duces idcirco, quod Lucilius carpsit Metellum et Lupum ceterosque principes uiros Rom<a>e. Lupus princeps senatus fuit. <METELLO>. Macedonici filio.

There is more by way of context: Lucilius was not simply motivated by licence; his attacks were partisan. A few lines on, another comment follows.

Cecilius Metellus consularis; hic filios consulares vidit et ab ipsis elatus est; potens fuit temporibus Scipionis Africani, et cum seditione quaedam adversum se facta clamaret, Scipio ait: hi sunt quos Hannibali eripui; patere ergo, inquit, nos liberos esse. Ob quod et alia Lucilius eum in gratiam Scipionis carpsit, quamvis amicum ipsius.[26]

C<a>ecilius Metellus, ex-consul. This man saw consular sons and was borne by them (to his funeral). He was powerful in the times of Scipio Africanus and when, during a disturbance, Scipio was loudly complaining of things done against him, he (*sc*. Scipio)

[20] J. Linderski, '*Fatalis*: a missing meretrix', *RhM* 140 (1997), 162–7 (= *Roman Questions II. Selected Papers* [Stuttgart, 2007], 332–6).

[21] The scholium in pseudo-Acro then adduces a verse from Lucan (10.60), more relevant in context. For a discussion, see Linderski (n. 20), 163–4 [333–4]. In a marvellously erudite and insightful exploration of this item, Linderski (n. 20, 166 [335] n.17) leans towards the acceptance of the observation that *fatalis* might indeed denote a common prostitute (*prostans* occurring as a substantive only in pseudo-Acro).

[22] Linderski (n. 20), 166 (and n.19) [335–6].

[23] For the commentary as 'not without interest', see W.M. Lindsay's review of O. Keller, *Pseudoacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora recensuit*, *CR* 19.1 (1905), 69–70. We have illustrated that point above. Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 4), l–li supply a list of such material for the *Odes*.

[24] Cf. K. Freudenburg, 'Introduction: Roman satire', in id. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire* (Cambridge, 2005), 10; though see also F. Muecke, 'Rome's first "satirists": themes and genre in Ennius and Lucilius', ibid. 33–47, at 43.

[25] Schol. Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.67 = O. Keller, *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora* 2 (Leipzig, 1904), 123–4. Porphyrio botches this. He offers only *Rutilium Lupum dicit.* This takes us nowhere. It is perhaps a confusion with P. Rutilius Rufus (cos. 105). Two P. Rutilii Lupi are known in the first century, the consul of 90 and the *tribunus plebis* of 56. Pseudo-Acro is happily independent of Porphyrio here.

[26] Schol. Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.72 = Keller, p. 124.

said 'These are they whom I snatched from Hannibal'; [Metellus] said, 'Suffer us, then, to be free.' On account of this, and other things, Lucilius calumniated him to please Scipio, although a friend of his (*sc*. although there had been friendship between Lucilius and Metellus).

This is clearly neither a late antique nor a medieval invention. It goes back to a historical datum (and offers us the only notice of same). In seeking to elaborate and place this comment in a historical context, two options present themselves. The contemplation of options is required because the scholiast is in a muddle. The Scipio of Lucilius' world was Scipio Aemilianus, and his counterpart is likely to have been Metellus Macedonicus – possibly, though less likely, one of Macedonicus' four sons. Yet this identification will not satisfy the Second Punic War context that pseudo-Acro provides with his reference to the Scipio who confronted Hannibal.

The first option is to identify the Scipio Africanus with the consul of 205: P. Africanus *maior*, the victor of Zama in 202. He would have the most cause to talk of snatching people from Hannibal (*hi sunt quos Hannibali eripui*), whether *eripere* is read as indicating a rescue or capture. But there is more to strengthen such speculation.[27] We hear from Polybius (23.14.1–4) that this Scipio, under threat of prosecution (in 187), refused to address the charges, asserting instead that it was simply improper that the Roman people should listen to any one who accused Publius Cornelius Scipio to whom those accusers owed it that they had the power of speech at all.[28] This, says Polybius, found favour with the assembled *polloi*.[29] Livy elaborates; the issue for many was whether Scipio's achievements, specifically his victory over Hannibal, had put him beyond petty answerability, or whether any individual was so eminent as to be above the law (38.50.7–8). For those who answered negatively to the latter, the nub was *aequanda libertas*: *nihil tam aequandae libertatis esse quam potentissimum quemque posse dicere causam*. His accusers argued that, in the war against Antiochus, where Scipio had served under his brother Lucius Scipio, he had acted more like a *dictator* than a legate (*dictatorem eum consuli, non legatum in provincia fuisse*, 38.51.3); that, under his shadow, the state which was supposedly mistress of the world lay concealed from sight (*sub umbra Scipionis civitatem dominam orbis terrarum latere*, 4). It was thought that an authentic version of the speech which Scipio delivered in his own vindication (he eschewed defence) was in circulation in the second century A.D. (cf. Gell. *NA* 4.18.6); this was one of the most famous examples of Roman rhetoric. This might, it could be suggested, provide the context in which an opponent would claim that Scipio's pretensions were endangering the freedom of his fellow citizens.

In this case, the Metellan counterpart would perhaps be Q. Metellus (cos. 206), L. Metellus (trib.pl. 213) or M. Metellus (praet. 206). The first of those made a speech in the senate to the effect that the victory at Zama had been a mixed blessing; the removal of Hannibal might have dangerous consequences for the energy of the Roman people (Val. Max. 7.2.3). That could be seen as slighting of the great achievement, but hardly as a criticism of Scipio. In fact, in 204, when

[27] Here we are in the debt of the anonymous reader for *CQ*, both for references and the suggestion of a plausible line of argument.

[28] The same story is retailed by Diodorus Siculus 29.21 (= *Constant. Exc.* 4, pp. 363–4), where it is said that Scipio's standing was incompatible with the dignity of the state; cf. App. *Syr*. 40.

[29] The surviving accounts of the trials of the Scipiones are problematic, and clearly flummoxed Livy (38.50.4–5; 56.1–10). The exact context(s) need not detain us here.

the absent Scipio had faced grave censure in the senate, this Metellus had thrown his support behind the man – in a moderate way (Livy 29.20.1–10), and in the following year, when Carthaginian envoys brought peace proposals to the Roman senate, Metellus deprecated any decision taken in the absence of the one man who could speak with authority: Scipio (30.23.3–4). Was this counsel a subtle way of bringing Scipio home? If so, very subtle.[30] Likewise, in 202, when the two newly installed consuls sought the casting of lots for *provinciae*, each of them eager to have Africa, Metellus passed a motion that 'neither refused nor gave Africa to them'. He proposed that the tribunes should put the vote to the people, and Scipio's interests carried the day. *Omnes tribus P. Scipionem iusserunt* (30.27.3–4). A different outcome could scarcely have been imagined. If it was, again, a subtle move to undermine Scipio, it was subtle indeed (and predictably unsuccessful). Q. Metellus was not a man who stood openly against Scipio, to put it mildly. Any quip of his towards Scipio was likely to be in the way of light banter (and that hardly suits the dire circumstance in which Scipio found himself in 187). L.(?) Metellus, on the other hand, did indeed have a run-in with Scipio back in 216, in the aftermath of Cannae, at which point Metellus had countenanced flight from Italy but been thwarted by the young Scipio – at sword-point (Livy 22.53.5–13). This Metellus had, in fact, suffered consequent civic demotion at the hands of the censors of 214 (24.18.3–9; cf. Val. Max. 2.9.8), and then attempted vengeance upon the same men as tribune – unsuccessfully (Livy 24.53.2–3). He is unlikely to have been remembered as a man who exchanged apophthegms with the great Africanus. On the praetor of 206, we know too little to engage in speculation. Q. Metellus (cos. 206), most likely to have been a sparring partner of Africanus *maior* (if never attested as such), will have been the father or, quite probably, the grandfather of Macedonicus.[31] In *none* of these cases does existing evidence suggest a likely person with whom Scipio shared verbal blows such as would ensure an enmity (and certainly not, as in this commentary, between one of the Metelli and Lucilius).

The alternative interpretation beckons. And, indeed, if the story is to include Lucilius, the acceptance of this option is fairly demanded. If the wit was Metellus Macedonicus or one of his sons (and, while not impossible, it would be more difficult to understand how that distinctive *cognomen* was falsely inserted into the story than to assume a confusion of Scipiones Africani), the Scipio targeted must be Africanus *minor*, that is to say, P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (cos. 147, 134),

[30] A slightly different version will be found in App. *Pun.* 31–2, and Livy's account is thought to have been built upon a tendentious narrative. Metellus is usually thought to be acting as a friend of Scipio; D. Hoyos, *Hannibal's Dynasty. Power and Politics in the Western Mediterranean, 247–183 BC* (London, 2003), 169; cf. H.H. Scullard, *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician* (London, 1970), 114, 166, 169–70, 179; J.F. Lazenby, *Hannibal's War* (Warminster, 1978), 191, 193, 201, 213, 217. J. Van Ooteghem, *Les Caecilii Metelli de la République* (Brussels, 1967), 32, characterizes him as an *ardent partisan de Scipion*. No evidence undercuts that judgement.

[31] Macedonicus was, according at least to the tradition preserved by Pliny, the son of Q. Metellus (cos. 206) and grandson of L. Metellus (cos. 251, 247), but the matter can be debated; cf. M.K. Hopkins, *Death and Renewal* (Cambridge, 1983), 46 n. 22; R.J. Evans, 'Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus', *AClass* 29 (1986), 99–103; E. Badian, 'The consuls, 179–49 BC', *Chiron* 20 (1990), 371–413, at 379; K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic. An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research* (Princeton, 2010), 82 n. 26 (with a stemma on p. 83). The birth date of Macedonicus, around 188 (on which, see G.V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's* Brutus*: Prosopography and Chronology* [Toronto and Buffalo, 1973], 43 [R 31]), rules out an identification with someone exchanging witticisms with the elder Africanus.

and the exchange will have occurred after Scipio the Younger's return from Spain in 132.[32] This second hypothesis has much to commend it. Metellus Macedonicus, the man clearly identified by the reference to his sons, was a well-known opponent of Scipio. Cicero counts Macedonicus amongst the *obtrectatores* of Scipio (*Rep.*1.31). Indeed, Valerius Maximus (4.1.12) labels them *inimici* – though the sources send mixed messages as to whether their *dissensio* ever descended into bitterness and rancour.[33] Our commentator, however, asserts that the participant in this exchange was a son of Macedonicus. That is not impossible. The eldest, Q. Balearicus (cos. 123), was certainly of senatorial standing by this time, and the second son (L. Metellus 'Diadematus') had possibly been elevated to that rank during his father's censorship (131/0) – he was certainly of quaestorian standing by the end of Scipio's lifetime. Moreover Cicero (*De or*. 2.267) records an unpleasant exchange between Scipio and the youngest of Macedonicus' sons, C. Metellus Caprarius (cos. 113), the contretemps occurring sometime in the period 134–132 and Caprarius emerging the wounded party. All four of Macedonicus' sons advanced to prominence during the period of Lucilius' *floruit*. Yet none of Macedonicus' sons could fairly be described as one of the *principes* of the day. *Primores*, perhaps? An indication of high social standing and political expectations, in advance of their personal achievement? In most cases, *primoris* is seen as approximating *princeps*, though one thinks of the *primores iuvenum* at Livy 2.33.5, young men undertaking early military service, one of whom would later become the notorious Coriolanus (but at this stage, and in the same passage, labelled *adulescens*).[34]

More to the point, the outburst of Scipio (*hi sunt quos … eripui*) which is said to have sparked the Metellan risposte matches closely a fiery *dictum Scipionis* that was aimed at a hostile crowd towards the end of Aemilianus' career (as his opposition to the Gracchan land programme undercut the war hero's former popularity); his hecklers were those 'whom he had himself sold as prisoners of war' (*quos ego sub corona vendidi*).[35] Allowing a different twist to *eripere* (and a more likely one in our opinion), the parallel is compelling. Scipio had not rescued these people from Carthage; he had carried them off from their homeland in chains.

For a number of reasons, we would favour the second of the two options outlined above (as we have argued more fully elsewhere, where we explore the historical context).[36] We believe that, at the base of this scholium was a reference to Scipio Aemilianus' clash with Metellus Macedonicus, and a resultant breach between Macedonicus and Lucilius. A sequence of events is easy enough to imagine. Horace alluded to Lucilius' readiness to satirize prominent members of his contemporary world. Claranus, Modestus, Terentius Scaurus, Helenius Acro (or whoever) filled in the details and added background – one of Lucilius' targets

[32] Most probably, we would argue, in 129 – though there is no need to press that point here. Cf. J.L. Beness, 'Carbo's tribunate of 129 and the associated *dicta Scipionis*', *Phoenix* 63 (2009), 60–72.

[33] Cic. *Mur.* 66; *De or*. 2.154; *Amic.* 77; *Off.* 1.87; Plin. *HN* 7.144 Cf. A.E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford, 1967), 24.

[34] On normal usage, see J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République* (Paris, 1963), 338–9. The scholium offered in pseudo-Acro is, as we have seen above, in no doubt that Lucilius' targets were *principes*, *duo duces* – but that need not be the last word. Every gloss is as likely as not to take us further from the original datum.

[35] [Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill.* 58; cf. Val. Max. 6.2.3.

[36] J.L. Beness and T.W. Hillard, 'Another voice against the "tyranny" of Scipio Aemilianus in 129 BC.?', *Historia* 61.3 (2012), 270–281.

had been a Metellus, the early commentator perhaps adding that it was a son of Macedonicus (this was otherwise a strange invention or confusion on the part of the later scholiast). This was the result of personal *animus*, the commentator explained, the satirist having taken umbrage at the occasion on which Macedonicus (unmistakably, as noted above, 'the *consularis* whose consular sons bore him to his final rest')[37] had parried Scipio, when Scipio had asserted that the unworthy crowd before him were the ex-slaves he had once himself carried away from Carthage – men whom he had snatched from Africa (*hi sunt quos Carthagine eripui*[*t*]), either a direct quotation from one version of Scipio's *obiter dictum* in circulation or a gloss. Metellus, present at the *contio*, had decided not to let slip the opportunity of underlining Scipio's savage carelessness in so discounting the dignity of the assembled citizenry. As Valerius Maximus remembered the story (6.2.3), Scipio had demanded silence (*taceant*) and received it (*universus populus … tacuit*). Quite a feat. Valerius Maximus repeats the point – a number of times. Scipio had silenced the entire Forum: *totius tunc fori <ora> clauserunt* (the addition was suggested by K. Kempf, in his 1854 Berlin edition, and is usually accepted). *Silentium* followed.[38]

There can be no doubt as to the scenario Valerius Maximus intended to convey. All were muted – except (if we follow the evidence of pseudo-Acro) for one voice, of which Valerius Maximus was ignorant: that of Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus. Valerius Maximus' item does nothing, we hasten to add, to undermine the acceptance of the riposte as a genuine *dictum* of Metellus Macedonicus. The assertion that every voice was stilled occurs in one of those typical flourishes with which Valerius Maximus characteristically brings to a close many of his anecdotes.[39] In these, he takes leave of his sources and exercises creative rhetoric; historical exactitude is not to be sought here. Indeed, Valerius Maximus, earlier in his historical report, gives the lie to his own fanciful envisioning of the incident at the end. After Scipio's demand for silence, the opposite followed: *orto deinde murmure 'non efficietis' ait.* It was the rising clamour against him that led directly to a second salvo, with Scipio self-protesting his courage and more closely defining the insult in a way that gave Metellus his opening. Scipio's words were delivered *in* the context of din, not its absence. Valerius' picture conveys what such an anecdote was *meant* to convey: the one against many, and the effective silencing of the crowd by the *auctoritas* of an individual.[40] This was the way in which

[37] For this distinguishing mark of Macedonicus, Cic. *Brut.* 81, 212; *Fin*. 5.83; *Tusc*. 1.85; Val. Max. 7.1.1; Vell. Pat. 1.11.6; Plin. *HN* 7.143; 146; Plut. *De fort. Rom*. 4 [= *Mor*. 318B–C]; [Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill.* 61; August. *De civ. D.* 2.23 (this last, allotting him five consular sons).

[38] The passage has indeed been taken to labour under perverse repetition which can only be saved by the suggestion of wordplay; cf. W.S. Watt's alternative suggestion, in 'Notes on Valerius Maximus and Velleius Paterculus', *Klio* 68 (1986), 466–78, at 471 – an emendation that is allowed to go unregistered in D.R. Shackleton Bailey's Loeb edition (2000).

[39] On the epigrammatic closures, see W.M. Bloomer, *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility* (Chapel Hill, 1992), 250; cf. 196, 240.

[40] It is an *exemplum* of the type to which Valerius has already given attention. The image pleased him. In a section on *fiducia*, laudable self-confidence, he has praised P. Scipio Nasica (cos. 138) – it is difficult, he says, to go past the Scipiones when seeking memorable examples – for demanding quiet from a noisy gathering and receiving, in response, the reverential silence of all (3.7.3). This is all the more interesting given that Valerius has, in close precedence (3.7.1e–g), recalled the episodes in which Scipio Africanus *the Elder* performed *his* acts of defiance. The scope for confusion is clear; and the circumstantial details, it might be said, have just fallen into place.

Scipio Aemilianus' apophthegm would have been circulated in versions that were, as they almost universally are, favourable to him. What is so valuable here is the way in which this item transmits an alternative (in which Scipio did not have the last word).

We return, then, to Metellus' riposte to Scipio Aemilianus. It had obviously never been intended that he and other nobles should feel in any way associated with those whom Scipio would have considered the *sentina urbis* (in another version of Scipio's outburst we are told that Scipio called those who had given him offence the 'stepchildren of Italy'), but Metellus had chosen – whether from a mischievous instinct to diminish Scipio's reputation with those whose favour he had so recently exploited, or from a desire to ingratiate a group whose goodwill he (Metellus) had not previously enjoyed – to take advantage of Scipio's impetuous negligence.[41] He embraced identification with the multitude (which Scipio in still another version of the outburst had identified as consisting of, as mentioned above, ex-slaves, freedmen): 'Treat us then as if we were, as we are, free men.'[42] A lesson in contional etiquette was the last thing that Scipio needed at this turbulent stage of his career, and Lucilius, an admirer and friend, sharpened his quill for a future campaign against the Metellan brood (perhaps unleashed on an unlucky son of Macedonicus). It was, however, Scipio's presence that dominated later thoughts; Metellus' apophthegm fell into second place. The commentator – either the scholiast who composed the surviving note or his source – has misread Scipio's outburst, or *misremembered* it, and remembered instead the more famous controversial behaviour of Scipio the Elder at his trial in 187, a story which hinged on Scipio's high-handed disregard for the constraints upon ordinary citizenry. The scholiast will then have emended the report that the Scipio in question had carried off people from Carthage to read that Scipio had snatched people from Hannibal. For *hi sunt quos Carthagine eripui*, he substituted *hi sunt quos Hannibali eripui*. Indeed, in the version of Scipio's speech in 187 preserved by Appian (*Syr.* 40), Scipio *maior* had said that 'on this day, citizens, I won the victory which laid Carthage at your feet, Carthage that had lately been such an object of terror to you'. This subconscious blending of two historic occasions will also explain pseudo-Acro's choice of words when *his* Scipio is described as 'loudly complaining of things done against him'. The muddle was complete.

Valerius Maximus has performed for us another service. In the passage discussed above (6.2.3), he demonstrates the attraction of elision; that is to say, he has, in a sense, elided – in the fashion of our scholiast – the two Scipiones. The silence his Scipio (i.e. Aemilianus) elicited from the People was not the product of fear,

[41] For the concept of the *sentina urbis*, Cic. *Att.* 1.19.4. For the 'stepchildren' gibe, Val. Max. 6.2.3; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.4.4; Plut. *Apophth. Scip. Min.* 22 [= *Mor*. 201E–F]); Polyaenus, *Strat.* 8.16.5. For Scipio's exploitation of the 'frequenters of the Forum', Plut. *Aem.* 38.4; and for his ongoing popularity with the *demos* (underpinning irregular political advancement as late as 135), App. *Hisp.* 84. Macedonicus, on the other hand, had twice faced defeat at consular elections because of a reputation for severity (*invisus plebi ob nimiam severitatem*; [Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill.* 61), reverses not easily forgotten (though now over a decade old). Scipio had now eclipsed that reputation for severity in his more recent exercise of the Numantine command (134–132), bringing an end to the troops' corrupted lassitude and recalling them to the most rigorous military discipline; Livy, *Per.* 57: 'Scipio Africanus Numantiam obsedit et corruptum licentia luxuriaque exercitum ad severissimam militiae disciplinam revocavit'; cf. App. *Hisp*. 85–6.

[42] For Scipio's characterization of the crowd as *liberti*, Val. Max. 6.2.3. Once *alligati*, they were now *soluti*.

but a sense of the gratitude owed to his achievements, of the benefits conferred by the Aemilian and Cornelian clans, and consciousness of the many anxieties from which Italy had thus been freed. It is almost as if Valerius Maximus (like pseudo-Acro?) has both Scipionic stances in mind.[43]

We close by underlining two observations: the first, that the item demonstrates that the scholiasts do indeed preserve exciting material not elsewhere found; and the second that, however the item is to be interpreted, it will not stand in the form in which the scholiast offers it. Only with amendment will the scholium be rendered meaningful, and it can be massaged with confidence only by recourse to firmer (external) historical data. Whichever of the interpretations we offer is correct (and we believe we have pointed to the correct one), the scholiasts whose labours would eventually form pseudo-Acro did not transmit items exactly as they were originally found. The commentators, who felt it their business to contextualize literary allusions, felt confident to contextualize as well the items that they proffered in assistance. In doing so they drew on their own historical memories. That is a worry.[44]

Macquarie University

T.W. HILLARD
thomas.hillard@mq.edu.au
J.L. BENESS
lea.beness@mq.edu.au

[43] Note the way in which Watt (n. 38) glosses the *exemplum*: 'Thanks to the great services rendered by Scipio Africanus to Rome, the *plebs* remained silent when insulted by him at a *contio*.' It is easy to imagine what a mind less versed in Roman history might take from that. Watt correctly glosses Valerius, but takes the item away from the context in which Scipio's harsh words were exchanged with the assembly, and probably obscures the outcome as well.

[44] This paper arose as part of the Macquarie Dictionary of Roman Biography Project, generously funded in its initial phases by Dr Colleen McCullough-Robinson. Research was further facilitated by a grant awarded to Beness from the Gale Travel Scholarship fund. We also acknowledge the valuable advice of our colleague, Dr Patrick Tansey, the thought-provoking challenges of the anonymous reader for *CQ*, and our gratitude to the editors.