

## Studies on Cato's *Ad filium*

Alexander Kuznetsov

The paper deals with a group of fragments collected by Jordan under the title *Libri ad Marcum filium* and generally considered to be remains of Cato's didactic treatise addressed to his son. The only large and coherent extracts from the *Ad filium* are fr. 1-2 Jordan (Plin. *NH* 29.7.14-15; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23). In this document Cato denounces Greek doctors as impostors and conspirators and instead recommends a popular medicine of his own. Fragment 1 appears to be the most ferocious attack carried by Cato on the Greeks and the Greek culture. The other fragments are short and truncated quotations provided by Roman Grammarians or Plutarch, and some of them deal with medical matters. I try to argue that the source for fr. 1 was a private letter, addressed by Cato to his son. This interpretation is likely to eliminate an odd Hellenophobic pathos of fr. 1. As far as the shorter fragments are concerned, my study of the reference-formulae demonstrates that a didactic treatise *Ad filium* had never been known to grammarians, and the so-called *Ad filium* fragments cannot be reduced to one source. It can be stated, however, that all the medical fragments go back to one text, that is, the same Cato's epistle. Moreover, one intermediate source for these fragments may be established, a source which is probably to be identified as the *Dubius sermo* of Pliny. It may also be surmised that, in quoting the *Ad filium*, Plutarch had used some Latin grammatical source, but not the original text of Cato.

### Prooemium

In a paper published in 1850 Otto Jahn argued that Cato Censorius had composed the 'first Roman Encyclopedia' dedicated to his son Marcus and called *Praecepta ad filium*.<sup>1</sup> The fragments, in which Cato appears to have addressed his son, belong to the fields of

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on a series of lectures given at Moscow Lomonosov University in 2006-2007, and the gist of it was read at the 39th annual conference of the Israel Society for the Promotion of Classical Studies in June 2010. I am grateful to all colleagues for their helpful criticism. I owe special thanks for two anonymous referees at *Scripta Classica Israelica* for their engaged and thoughtful reading of this article.

O. Jahn, 'Über römische Encyclopädien', in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich-Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, 2, 1850, 263-272. For the recent bibliography, and on the problem of Cato's *Ad filium* in general see W. Suerbaum, 'M. Porcius Cato (Censorius)', in *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike, Bd. I: Die archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sulas Tod ... hrsgb. von W. Suerbaum, unter Mitarb. von J. Blänsdorf*, München, 2002, 409-403. — F. J. LeMoine, 'Parental Gifts: Father-Son Dedications and Dialogues in Roman Didactic Literature', *ICS*, 16, 1991, 344, contains a short note on Cato's *Ad filium* based upon A.E. Astin, *Cato the Censor*, Oxford, 1978, 332-340. — Henceforth the fragments of *Ad filium*, will be referred to by the numbers of Jordan: *M. Catonis praeter librum de re rustica quae extant* H. Jordan recensuit et prolegomena scripsit, Lipsiae, 1860.

medicine, rhetoric and agriculture, to which Jahn added some texts, which were not expressly connected with Cato's son: the *Commentarii iuris civilis*, the *Liber de re militari*, the *Carmen de moribus*, identified by Jahn as a collection of Cato's sayings. The Encyclopedia *Ad filium* emerged as a surprisingly systematic exposition of didactic matters in six parts, presumably books, each dealing with a single branch of knowledge. Jahn assumed that these six books had served as a model for the Encyclopedia by Cornelius Celsus.<sup>2</sup> In fact, Quintilian at *Inst.* 12.11.9; 24 says that Celsus wrote just six works comprising precisely the same six topics, and at *Inst.* 12.11.23 he mentions the same six *artes*, along with additional history, when describing the literary interests of Cato:

*Marcus igitur Cato, idem imperator, idem sapiens, idem orator, idem historiae conditor, idem iuris, idem rerum rusticarum peritissimus ...*

It seems therefore that, speaking about Roman encyclopedic writers, Quintilian had in mind Cato's six volumes. This theory is vulnerable in many points. Quintilian does not indicate the titles of Cato's books directly. The division of subject matter attested at *Inst.* 12.11.23 is of great interest,<sup>3</sup> but it is not easy to read it as a list of Cato's didactic writings. In this case we should substitute, for example, the title *Liber de re militari* for the word *imperator* used by Quintilian, and so on. But the utterance *rerum rusticarum peritissimus* cannot point to the extant book on agriculture, which is not addressed to *Marcus filius*.

The theory of the six-volume Encyclopedia was challenged by Heinrich Jordan, who reduced the corpus to the fragments that were in some way connected with the formula *ad filium*. Accordingly, the *Liber de re militari*, the *Carmen de moribus* and the *Apophthegmata* became separate entries in Jordan's edition. The title *Libri ad Marcum filium* comprised three works supplied with the reconstructed titles [*De medicina*], [*De agri cultura*], [*De rhetorica*]. But arrangement of the fragments remained the same as that established by Jahn. In subsequent studies by Antonio Mazzarino,<sup>4</sup> Allan E. Astin<sup>5</sup> and Erich S. Gruen<sup>6</sup> the theory of the Encyclopedia was further reconsidered, and the *Ad filium* was conceived of as one book without a systematic plan. The corpus itself, however, has never been questioned. Meanwhile, the approach offered by Jahn and followed by Jordan, is in many respects no less controversial, than the reconstruction of Cato-Celsus relations, of which Jordan disapproved. In this paper I shall argue that the *Ad filium* corpus as established by Jahn and Jordan is an artificial and heterogeneous farrago. Nevertheless, the medical fragments are to be recognized as remains of a hypothetical text, which may be identified as a private letter addressed by Cato to his son, presumably *Marcus Porcius Cato Licinianus*.

<sup>2</sup> Jahn (see n. 1), 273-274.

<sup>3</sup> Its origin remains unknown, but it is probably the same tradition that imbued Cato with a wide range of skills and knowledge. As Gruen has suggested, it could go back to Cato himself: E.S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, London, 1993, 59.

<sup>4</sup> A. Mazzarino, *Introduzione al De agri cultura di Catone*, Roma, 1952, 19-29.

<sup>5</sup> Astin (see n. 1), 332-340.

<sup>6</sup> Gruen (see n. 3), 75-78.

The most extensive fragments are preserved in book 29 of the *Natural History* of Pliny, who partly quotes and partly paraphrases Cato's text, (*NH* 29.7.14 = fr.1-2); these same pieces are also summarized by Plutarch in the *Vita Catonis* (*Cat. Mai.* 23).<sup>7</sup>

Fragment 1 is a well-known and much-discussed document, being the most impressive evidence of Cato's hatred for the Greeks and their culture brought in by Plutarch.<sup>8</sup> Cato appears to incriminate Greek doctors for a conspiracy against the Romans. This odd statement reminds us of some of the darkest episodes of modern history,<sup>9</sup> and it well fits the image of an aggressive conservator. If the hatred for the Greeks were a fundamental principle of Cato's cultural philosophy, then an anti-Hellenic insinuation would be quite at home in his didactic treatise. This has been problematized by Astin's argument that Cato's attitude to Greek culture had been more flexible and positive. Astin saw a hyperbolized expression of irrational prejudices in Cato's bizarre warning about Greek doctors.<sup>10</sup> Later Gruen suggested that Cato had employed a sophisticated rhetorical tactic, and that the striking medical conspiracy should not be treated seriously, being again a 'plain hyperbole, designed to arrest readers' attention'.<sup>11</sup>

This problem will be convincingly solved if we recognize fr. 1 as an excerpt from a letter.<sup>12</sup> This is the subject of the first part of this paper. In the second part I shall

<sup>7</sup> J. Scarborough, *Roman Medicine*, Ithaca, 1969, 52-55; V. Nutton, *Ancient Medicine*, London, 2004, 161.

<sup>8</sup> G. Garbarino, *Roma e la filosofia greca dalle origini alla fine del II secolo A. C. Raccolta di testi con introduzione e commento*, Torino, 1973, vol. 2, 315-316. — Cato's anti-Hellenism is generally reduced to a conflict of educational models: see M. Morford, *Roman Philosophers: from the time of Cato the Censor to the death of Marcus Aurelius*, London and N.Y., 2002, 17; J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Paris, 1988, 537-539; but against this, Astin (see n. 1), 341-342. I shall touch on this question in § 1.2.

<sup>9</sup> B.H. Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*, Princeton, 2004, 229.

<sup>10</sup> Astin (see n. 1), 172.

<sup>11</sup> Gruen (see n. 3), 78. — The concept of Cato's attitude towards Greeks as it was developed by Astin and Gruen has not been unanimously accepted; thus for instance Cato's xenophobia was stressed by A. Henrichs, 'Graecia Capta: Roman Views of Greek Culture', *HSCP*, 97, 1995, 245-248; and B.H. Isaac (see n. 9), 225-229, 385. For the most detailed philological arguments against Astin's theory see C. Letta, 'L'Italia dei "mores romani" nelle Origines di Catone [1]', *Athenaeum*, 62, 1984, 3-30. I think, however, that Letta failed to demonstrate, that all the acts and gestures of Cato, which were believed to be anti-Hellenic, had been motivated by his coherent 'nationalistic' ideology.

<sup>12</sup> It was Fr. Leo, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, Bd. 1, Berlin, 1913, 279, n.1, who claimed that fr. 1 quoted by Pliny *NH* 29.7 was a passage from Cato's letter (see also n. 75 below), but since Leo this idea has never been elaborated. P. Cugusi, *Studi sull'epistolografia latina, I: L'età preciceroniana* (= *AFLC* 33, 1), Cagliari, 1970, 49, argued that fr. 4 (= Cato fr. 8 of Cugusi's edition of the *Epistolographi Latini minores*) was a quotation from a letter (on this point Cugusi wrongly adduced Leo, 276, n.3). But Cugusi preferred to identify fr. 1 (= Cato fr. 10 Cugusi) as 'a preface to some book', see *Epistolographi Latini minores*, Vol. 1.2, 1970, 35. Fr. Della Corte, 'Catone Maggiore e i "Libri ad Marcum filium"', *RFIC*, 19, 1941, 89, considered the books *Ad filium* (at least in the part on agriculture) as a collection of private prescripts prepared by Cato for his elder son soon after he had married the daughter of Aemilius Paullus. P.L. Schmidt, 'Catos

examine the other fragments of the *Ad filium*, and their tradition in the grammatical sources.

## 1. Cato Playing a Game with Hellenism.

### 1.1. Fragment 1 and the Problem of *Opici*

fr. 1(a) Jordan. Plinius *NH* 29.7.14 (Ernout)

*Dicam de istis Graecis suo loco, Marce fili, quid Athenis exquisitum habeam, et quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere. vincam nequissimum et indocile esse genus illorum. et hoc puta vatem dixisse, quandoque ista gens suas litteras dabit, omnia conrumpet, tum etiam magis, si medicos suos hoc mittet. iurarunt inter se barbaros necare omnis medicina, sed hoc ipsum mercede facient, ut fides iis sit et facile disperdant.*<sup>13</sup> *nos quoque dicitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios Opicos*<sup>14</sup> *appellatione foedant. interdixi tibi de medicis.*<sup>15</sup>

Cato speaks about two items of evidence for the hostility of Greeks to the Romans: a medical conspiracy and abusive *Opici*. As Gruen wisely pointed out, Cato ‘provided a mirror image of the Greek denunciation of Roman barbarism, thus exposing both as caricatures’.<sup>16</sup> The crucial difficulty with this interpretation is that the rhetorical mechanism described by Gruen seems to be too subtle and sophisticated. How could a reader understand Cato’s irony and recognize *caricatures* in his ‘prophetic’ statement? In any case, Cato puts together the medical conspiracy with the ethnic name *Opici*. And it seems to be a key to the whole passage.

It would have been an indignity for a Roman to be called *Opicus* (direct evidence, however, is lacking), and M. Dubuisson<sup>17</sup> suggested that by Cato’s time *Opici* had become a conventional term of abuse for Romans among the Greeks of Italy and, more precisely, among the Greeks dwelling in Rome. *Opici* must have marked the Roman inurbanity, being a counterpart to the scornful label *Graeculi*. This view, however, is not supported by the extant data, either Greek or Latin.

In Greek Ὀπικοί and the cognate words denote a certain ethno-geographical concept. Thucydides 6.4.5 says that the city of Cumae lay ἐν Ὀπικίᾳ. The Land of Ὀπικοί,

---

Epistula ad M. Filium und die Anfänge der Römischen Briefliteratur’, *Hermes*, 100, 1979, 575-576, distinguished the *Encyclopedia* from Cato’s letters concerning the military service of his son (§ 1.4 below), both works considered to be the early examples of ‘isagogischer Lehrbrief’; but Schmidt did not specify the literary form of the presumed epistolary *Encyclopedia*.

<sup>13</sup> *disperdant scilicet nos.*

<sup>14</sup> The best mss. read *hoppicos* (the Florentinus Riccardianus R) or *hoppocos* (the Leidensis Vossianus V), which was corrected by Hermolaus Barbarus (*Castigationes Plinianae*, 1492). The accusative *Opicos* is grammatically correct, cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 652: *quo nos vocabis nomine? — Libertos. — Non patronos?* It is unlikely that Cato used the Greek Ὀπικῶν (Jahn, Mayhoff) or the Hellenized *Opicon* (Urlichs, Jones, *ThLL*).

<sup>15</sup> The phrase *interdixi tibi de medicis* is added by correctors of RV, it is lacking in the Toletanus T, but it is preserved in the Parisinus 6795 E.

<sup>16</sup> Gruen (see n. 3), 78.

<sup>17</sup> M. Dubuisson, ‘Les *opici* : Osques, Occidentaux ou Barbares?’, *Latomus*, 42, 1983, 522-545.

according to Aristotle, included Latium,<sup>18</sup> but it is unlikely that such usage could excite Cato's indignation. Dubuisson<sup>19</sup> pointed to an epigram of Philodemus (*AP* 5.132.12 Sider), in which a courtesan named Φλώρα is described. She is attractive but not learned and probably does not know Greek well. According to Dubuisson, this fault is implied by the adjective Ὀπικῆ. Sider on the contrary comments on this word: 'neither "barbarous"<sup>20</sup> nor "Italian" in general, but "Oscan"<sup>21</sup>.

Latin shows quite a contrary semantic preference. Except for one gloss by Festus,<sup>22</sup> there is no instance of ethno-geographical denotation. From M. Tullius Tiro<sup>23</sup> onward *Opicus* occurs in the sense 'unlearned'<sup>24</sup> with the connotation of 'ignorant of Greek', which Dubuisson assumes to be the original meaning attested by Cato. In fact, the instances of *Opicus* / *Opici* are attested exclusively in special contexts that deal with scholarly or literary activity, and grammarians are hinted at in the *Satires* of Juvenal as *Opici mures* (3.207) and *Opica amica* (6.455).<sup>25</sup> This seems to contradict the theory of Dubuisson. We see that *Opicus* was an idiom of relatively late learned language, and this idiom could hardly have appeared in the first half of the second century, when country folk of Italy did not even speak Latin:

*qui Obsce et Volsce fabulantur, nam Latine nesciunt.*<sup>26</sup>

Moreover, Cato's passage is likely to have become a probable source on which Roman scholars could have drawn for their use of the term *Opicus*.<sup>27</sup>

We must now have a closer look at one of the most-discussed instances of Ὀπικοί, that is, (Pseudo-) Plato's eighth *Epistle* 353e:

<sup>18</sup> Fr. 609 Rose 700 Gigon = Dion *Ant.* 1.72: εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς Ὀπικῆς, ὃς καλεῖται Λάτιον ἐπὶ τῷ Τυρρηρικῷ πελάγει κείμενος.

<sup>19</sup> Dubuisson (see n.17), 544.

<sup>20</sup> 'Barbarous' is the translation of Liddell-Scott-Jones s.v. Ὀπικοί.

<sup>21</sup> D. Sider, *The Epigrams of Philodemus: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*, New York and Oxford, 1997, 108. Philodemus actually says: *like Perseus loved the Indian girl Andromeda, so I love Flora, though she is Oscan and cannot sing the poems of Sappho*: εἰ δ' Ὀπικῆ καὶ Φλώρα καὶ οὐκ ἄδουσα τὰ Σαπφούς, Ἴ καὶ Περσεὺς Ἰνδῆς ἠράσατ' Ἀνδρομέδης. Dubuisson was wrong in stating that the name *Flora* shows the Roman origin of a girl; cf. Sider ad loc.

<sup>22</sup> The Lemma OBSCUM 189 M 204.24 L, partially quoted in n. 26 below.

<sup>23</sup> M. Tullius Tiro apud Gell. 13.9.4 = fr. 13 Funaioli.

<sup>24</sup> OPICUS, *ThLL* 9.2, 702, 80: *significat aliquid abhorrens a doctrina vel urbanitate hominum eruditorum*.

<sup>25</sup> For Gellius *Opicus* became a nuance in the satirical representation of professional grammarians; see W. Keulen, *Gellius the Satirist. Roman Cultural Authority in Attic Nights*, Leiden, 2009, 28.

<sup>26</sup> Festus 189 M 204.29 L = Titinius 103 Daviault. After quoting Titinius, Festus continues with the etymology of *obscenus*: *a quo etiam verba impudentia elata appellantur obscena, quia frequentissimus fuit usus Oscis libidinum spurcarum*. It is unclear whether Festus (that is Verrius Flaccus) referred to Cato's *Ad filium* when he tied *Osci* to *libidines spurcae*. Cf. Lucilius 150 Marx: *Samnis, spurcus homo, vita illa dignu locoque*. But we should not believe Nonius who put Lucilius 150 under the entry SPURCUM *saevum vel sanguinosum* (393.28 M 631 L), and the etymology *Obscus – obscenus* is equally fantastic.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Keulen (see n. 25), 11, n. 32.

... σχεδὸν εἰς ἔρημίαν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς φωνῆς Σικελία πάσα, Φοινίκων ἢ Ὀπικῶν μεταβαλοῦσα εἰς τινα δυναστείαν καὶ κράτος.

This passage is generally considered to be an argument against the authenticity of the eighth *Epistle*. R. Adam<sup>28</sup> recognized in Ὀπικῶν a hint at the Romans. He claimed that the prophecy of the dominance of the Carthaginians and the Romans would fit in well with the political situation that had existed in Southern Italy after the war with Pyrrhus. The intricate question of the authenticity of the Platonic *Epistles* is beyond the scope of the present study, yet I must add that for Adam the *Ad filium* was the only testimony to support his argument that 'the Greeks had associated the Roman people with the Oscans'. But Ὀπικῶν may designate mercenaries of Italic origin,<sup>29</sup> for, as we have seen, in Greek Ὀπικῶν had a wide geographical application. The author of the eighth *Epistle* could also remember the destiny of Cumae, besieged and captured by the Oscans in 421 B.C.E. On the one hand, it is unlikely that Rome is hinted at in the eighth *Epistle*, but on the other, a concerned reader and, first and foremost, a Roman reader would be ready to recognize Rome in the *power of the Opici*. We have to concede the possibility that speaking about the *Opici* Cato alluded to the Ὀπικῶν of the eighth *Epistle*.

This suggestion is corroborated by the Greek text, where the warning against the onslaught of barbarian might is followed by a medical metaphor:

... σχεδὸν εἰς ἔρημίαν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς φωνῆς Σικελία πάσα, Φοινίκων ἢ Ὀπικῶν μεταβαλοῦσα εἰς τινα δυναστείαν καὶ κράτος. τούτων δὴ χρῆ πάση προθυμίᾳ πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας τέμνειν φάρμακον.

A medical conspiracy may be recognized in the piece of advice 'to cut a medicine against the barbarians', so that in reverse both Ὀπικῶν and φάρμακον are reflected. The similarity cannot be a mere coincidence.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, τέμνειν φάρμακον is a transparent metaphor expressing the notion of 'finding a remedy', but it seems unlikely that Cato simply misunderstood the original phrase. He deconstructed the Greek text and from it fashioned a fantastic medical conspiracy. What could be the purpose of this game?

## 1.2. Cato's Attack on the Greeks

Fragment 1 begins with a phrase indicating the theme of communication between Cato and his addressee:

*Dicam de istis Graecis suo loco...*<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> R. Adam, *Über die Echtheit der platonischen Briefe*, Berlin, 1906, 25. Adam's arguments were accepted by L. Edelstein, *Plato's Seventh Letter*, Leiden, 1966, 146-147, n. 51, 155, n. 70.

<sup>29</sup> The arguments and the authorities for this understanding were collected by Fr. Novotný, *Platonis Epistolae commentariis illustratae*, Brno, 1930, 258.

<sup>30</sup> The other passages where Cato is believed to demonstrate his knowledge of Greek literature are listed by Letta (see n. 11), 11-13. — Plutarch, *Cat. Mai.* 23 350c, thought that Cato had borrowed the idea of a medical conspiracy from a letter of Hippocrates (IX p. 316 L. *Epp.* 4 and 5), who had refused to cure the Great King. But this situation has nothing in common with that described by Cato.

<sup>31</sup> This phrase tells nothing about a possible structure or content of the *Ad filium*; cf. Astin (see n. 1), 239.

Cato is involved in a discussion about the Greeks, and is about to shift to medical prescripts. Cato's attitude towards Greek doctors is not to be separated, however, from his attitude towards the Greeks in general. He rejects Greek medicine on exclusively ideological grounds, without having handled any medical problem, and *dicam suo loco* appears to be a rhetorical *aposiōpēsis*. Cato says that he suspends the discussion on 'these Greeks of yours', and continues immediately with important statements on this subject.

Cato imposes a general rule: *quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere*, which echoes the famous dictum from Ennius' *Andromacha*:

Cicero *De orat.* II.156 = fr. XXVIII 95 Jocelyn, 340 Rib3: *ac sic decrevi philosophari potius, ut Neoptolemus apud Ennium paucis nam omnino haud placet.*

This notion may be regarded as an anti-intellectual idea, but it is by no means anti-Hellenistic or particularly Roman.<sup>32</sup> Since the commentary of Vahlen, the speech of Callicles in Plato's *Gorgias* 483c has been recognized as a possible source for Ennius's maxim.<sup>33</sup> We can be confident that Cato knew the passage from the *Andromacha* (see further § 1.3, where I argue that the *Ad filium* was written in 168 BCE., when the activity of Ennius, if not his life, had already ended) and he saw it against the background of contemporary popular philosophy. The allusions to Plato's eighth *Epistle* show the same strategy: when attacking the Greeks, Cato draws on a Greek literary source,<sup>34</sup> in this way he understood the passage about 'cutting medicine' as an allegory for greedy Greek doctors.<sup>35</sup> As far as the *Opici* are concerned, Cato could see the Platonic letter as a prophecy about the future grandeur of Rome. But this seductive interpretation implied the humiliation of the Roman people, and therefore it had to be rejected. We see, then, that Cato's treatment of Greek texts and concepts briefly referred to in fr. 1, is a treatment that conforms to the strategy implied in his own words *litteras inspicere, non perdiscere*.

<sup>32</sup> H.D. Jocelyn, ed., *The Tragedies of Ennius: The Fragments Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge, 1967, 253.

<sup>33</sup> Φιλοσοφία γὰρ τοῖ ἐστίν, ὃ Σώκρατες, χάριεν, ἂν τις αὐτοῦ μετρίως ἄψηται ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ: ἐὰν δὲ περαιτέρω τοῦ δέοντος ἐνδιατρίψῃ, διαφθορὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων... In this passage the role of philosophy is restricted to the narrow limits of educating the youth which well fits the context of the *Ad filium*. See J. Vahlen, ed., *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*, Lipsiae, 1903, 191 (*fab. incert.*).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Cato's judgement of Socrates and Isocrates: Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23 350d. It is worth noting that two other Greek concepts seem to be attested in fr. 1. The first is *indocile*, which certainly translates the Greek *δυσμαθής*. After Cato the Latin word is not to be found before Cicero (*Lucull.* 2; *N.D.* 1.12); see INDOCILE, *ThLL* 7.1, 1216. Virgil therefore is in all likelihood alluding to the *Ad filium* in *Aen.* 8.321: *is genus indocile ...*, Servius elucidates on this point: *is genus indocile pro 'indoctum': nam 'indocile' est quod penitus non potest discere, 'indoctum' quod nondum didicit*, cf. J.M. André, *L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine des origines à l'époque augustéenne*, Paris, 1966, 42. Before the age of Cicero we find no instance of *appellatio* in the sense of 'designation', see: APPELLATIO, *ThLL* 2, 271, 48: 'significatio, nomen'. Both *indocilis* and *appellatio* seem to be of Cato's coinage, cf. Horace, *Ars P.* 55-58.

<sup>35</sup> As Pliny *NH* 29.8.16 states, the old-time Romans never paid for healing and refused to acknowledge medicine as a trade.

It must be stressed here that *inspicere* never means 'to treat superficially', 'to study lightly' or 'to look through'. Moreover, in most cases the verb denotes a careful study of an object or an exploratory military survey.<sup>36</sup>

Cato carefully 'explored' (if not 'scouted') the eighth *Epistle*, and found a reason why his son should avoid Greek medicine. It appears that a 'profit', *bonum*, which Cato derived from reading the Greek text was related to a specific personal case, discussed in § 1.3 below. The first phrase of fr. 1 certainly indicates that Cato was worried about his son's enthusiasm for some Greeks, and it is likely that the young man had been reading Greek books (why not the same eighth *Epistle*?) without the necessary caution recommended by his father. But here we must acknowledge that the *Ad filium* is a document too uncharacteristic to support any broad generalization.<sup>37</sup>

Did Cato take into account the wider ideological context of the eighth *Epistle*? It is tempting to conclude that his treatment of the tension between Greeks and barbarians was a parody of pan-Hellenic arrogance.<sup>38</sup> But Cato's motives may have been more complicated. The theme of professional work for money (certainly condemned by Cato) is worth emphasizing in this connection.<sup>39</sup>

Cato seems to be convinced that healing himself, his wife, child and slaves was the exclusive concern of his *familia*. His attitude towards teachers and teaching may be explained by the same disapproval of professional activity, rather than by hatred for the Greeks. Cato refused to employ a Greek slave teacher for his son Licinianus.<sup>40</sup> In 155 BCE he protested against what he considered an attack on basic social institutions and demanded that Carneades and the other envoy-philosophers be removed from Rome, where they tried to practice a standard Greek educational procedure, delivering speeches to young men.<sup>41</sup> It seems that Cato could find no appropriate place for a free Greek

<sup>36</sup> INSPICERE, *ThLL* 7.1, 1951, e.g. Plaut. *Poen.* 596: *ut sciamus quid dicamus mox pro testimonio*; Cato *De agri cultura* 76.4: *aperito, dum inspicias, bis aut ter*. — According to Garbarino (see n. 18), vol. 2.316, this interpretation of *inspicere* of the *Ad filium* was proposed by L. Alfonsi, 'Catone il Censore e l'umanesimo romano', *PP*, 9, 1954, 169.

<sup>37</sup> I cannot therefore agree with Letta (see n. 11), 23, who saw in fr. 1 'l'espressione di una lucida linea di politica culturale nazionalistica'.

<sup>38</sup> For the theme of Hellenism in the Platonic letters see G.J.D. Aalders H. Wzn., 'Political Thought and Political Programs in the Platonic Epistles', in K. von Fritz, ed., *Pseudoepigrapha I. Pseudopythagorica: Lettres de Platon litterature pseudoepigraphique juive. Huit exposés suivis de discussions*, Genève, 1972, 161-162. And for pan-Hellenism in general: Moses I. Finley, *The Ancestral Constitution*, Cambridge, 1971; J.M. Hall, *Hellenicity: between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago, 2002, 205-228.

<sup>39</sup> Cato saw Greek medicine as a kind of luxury, as opposed to traditional Roman parsimony. On the attitude of Cato towards 'luxury': Astin (see n. 1), 91-100 and Letta (see n. 11), 16, 19-22. cf. R. MacMullen, 'Hellenizing the Romans (2<sup>nd</sup> Century B.C.)', *Historia*, 40, 1991, 433, n. 49.

<sup>40</sup> Plutarch *Cato*, 20 348a-b, is explicit about Cato's reasons, so Letta (see n. 11), 5, was wrong in listing it among the anti-Hellenic gestures of Cato. Cato taught his son by himself, although he had a slave teacher Chilon who taught many slaves of Cato's household.

<sup>41</sup> In his report of this episode Plutarch *Cat. Mai.* 22 349d is emphasizing that the field of Carneades' activity was the City, πόλις. It was impossible for philosophers to speak in public (*cum populo agere*), and they must have lectured in private assemblies: εἰθὺς οὖν οἱ φιλολογώτατοι τῶν νεανίσκων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἔειπτο καὶ συνῆσαν, ἀκρώμενοι καὶ



professional, such as a doctor, or a teacher. I think that this surmise could explain the second part of Cato's dictum *non perdiscere*, where *perdiscere* must hint at learning by heart, the main method of Greek school teaching. The choice of word is significant, for *perdiscere* can denote a possession of socially relevant knowledge.<sup>42</sup> Cato shows that he does not admit Greeks into the life of the Roman community, therefore they should not take part in the education of Roman citizens, and their literature is not an object of *perdiscere*.

### 1.3. Cato's Letters *Ad filium*

A misleading identification of the genre and purposes of Cato's medical text obscured its real significance. Cato's pragmatic strategy has nothing to do with a patriarchal homily. It is certainly the strategy of a polemical letter. The author's voice is authoritarian and aggressive, and his purpose is a polemic against the incautious and superfluous philhellenism of his son (and, presumably, the young generation of the Roman aristocracy).

Astin<sup>43</sup> has convincingly demonstrated that Cato's medical text quoted by Pliny in book 29 of the *Natural History* had not in its original form been in a large compendium. Both Pliny *NH* 29.15 (= fr. 2) and Plutarch *Cat.Mai.* 23 250d are evidently paraphrasing Cato, when they report his memoirs (*commentarius*, ὑπόμνημα) with medical prescripts. It follows that the *commentarius* should not be identified with the *Ad filium*. The plausible solution would be to recognize in a shorter text a private letter written on a special occasion, this letter referring to the more extensive *commentarius*. The structure of the medical segment of this letter is quite clear from our fragments 1 and 2. The medical conspiracy had evolved from the theme of Hellenism to one of medical prescripts. Cato praised domestic medicine, reminded his son about his medical *commentarius*, and proceeded by quoting a few remedies from it. Cato wrote on *the* medicine, the remedies designed for a certain disease, rather than about medicine in general.

Some conjectures can be made about the historical circumstances of Cato's letter.<sup>44</sup> His second son Salonianus, born ca. 154 BCE was about five years old when his father

---

θαυμάζοντες αὐτούς. I agree with Gruen (see n. 3), 66, that it is unlikely 'that Cato genuinely feared the ability of Greek philosophers to erode Roman morals'. The case of the embassy proves that in Rome the attitude towards Greek philosophers was positive rather than hostile; cf. E. Gruen, *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*, Leiden, 1990, 174-176. However, Carneades' activity as a lecturer must have been seen as inappropriate and private assemblies could not avert suspicions. Plutarch states that Carneades became too popular among the young people. — An account of the embassy of 155 BCE is given by Garbarino (see n. 8), vol.1, 75-76, 80-86, vol.2, 313; see also Carneades frs. 23-29 Wiśniewski. For the recent discussion on the speech held by Carneades see J.E.G. Zetzl, 'Natural Law and Poetic Justice: A Carneadean Debate in Cicero and Virgil', *CPh*, 91, 1996, 297-319.

<sup>42</sup> Cic., *Balb.* 47: *omnia iura belli perdiscere ac nosse potuisse*; Cic.*Rep.* 2.27: *(Numa) quae perdiscenda quaeque observanda essent, multa constituit*.

<sup>43</sup> Astin (see n. 1), 334-336.

<sup>44</sup> The difficulties of dating *Ad filium*, if considered a didactic treatise, are discussed by Gruen (see n. 3), 77, and Schmidt (see n. 12).

died.<sup>45</sup> The letter was eventually addressed to Cato's elder son, M. Porcius Cato Licinianus, born about 191 BCE.<sup>46</sup> Cato was an old man when he wrote the letter, and this implies that the date of writing was not earlier than about 170 B.C.E. In 168 BCE. Licinianus served as a *miles* under L. Aemilius Paullus and fought bravely in the battle of Pydna.<sup>47</sup> Soon after the war he married a daughter of L. Aemilius Paullus, but the young couple lived in the house of the elder Cato until he himself remarried.<sup>48</sup> The Third Macedonian War would, therefore, be the most probable date for Cato writing to his son.

We know about two other letters which Cato sent to his son during that war. In one of them Cato praises the heroic conduct of Licinianus during the battle of Pydna.<sup>49</sup> In the other he informs him that because of his earlier discharge he had to renew his military oath before reentering into battle with the enemy.<sup>50</sup> A disease which was the subject of Cato's medical letter was a probable cause of this temporary disability of Licinianus.

## 2. Tradition: Tracing the Reference-Formulae.

### 2.1. The Corpus

By the expression 'reference-formula' I mean a title of a work quoted by a Roman grammarian, as well as the words introducing a quotation. The present study is based on the presumption that reference-formulae are generally uniform and fixed. Late grammarians rarely examined and excerpted classical texts directly, and the collections of quotations which we possess now (such as the *De conpendiosa doctrina* by Nonius Marcellus) are based on some earlier works of Roman grammarians. It is reasonable to assume that while copying some quotation out of an earlier compendium, a grammarian transferred the related reference-formula. In this sense reference-formulae are inherited in a direct manner. Respectively, differences in reference-formulae indicate that different intermediary sources were relied on.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Astin (see n. 1), 105.

<sup>46</sup> Astin (see n. 1), 54.

<sup>47</sup> Cicero *Off.* 1.37, Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 39 = Cato *Epist.* fr. 4 Jordan 6 Cugusi. See J. Linderski, 'Roman Officers in the Year of Pydna', *AJPh*, 111, 1990, p. 57. On the spurious Cicero *Off.* 1.36 see Jordan (see n. 1), ciiii, Cugusi (see n. 12), 51-53, and Schmidt (see n. 12, 569, n. 5), who considered it to be a genuine document.

<sup>48</sup> See Plut. 24 350e.

<sup>49</sup> Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20 348d = Cato *Epist.* fr. 3 Jordan 7 Cugusi.

<sup>50</sup> *Epist.* fr. 4 Jordan, see n. 47 above. This document seems to imply that Licinianus wished to return to the army and, consequently, at that time, the war was not over. It follows that this letter was written before the battle of Pydna.

<sup>51</sup> As a recognized research tool the notion of reference-formula and the utterance itself were established by W.M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin*, Oxford, 1901; cf. the word *Eingangsformel* used by R. Reitzenstein, *Verriatische Forschungen*, Breslau, 1887. For the relevant discussion of the problem of quotations, though not concerning titles and references directly, see R. Vainio, 'Use and Function of Grammatical Examples in Roman Grammarians', *Mnemosyne*, 53, 2000, 30-48. The essential data concerning titles of Latin literary texts were collected by N. Horsfall, 'Some Problems of Titulature in Roman Literary History', *BICS* 28, 1981, 103-114. Reference-formulae are closely connected with titles, however a reference does not necessary contain a title; see e.g. B.-J. Schröder, *Titel und Text*, Berlin - N.Y., 1999, 64-68 on the presumed *Passer* of Catullus (being the most important contribution to the study of titles in classical Greek and

The reference-formulae attached to the fragments of the *Ad filium* corpus are far from uniform, as shown in the list below. The disposition of the fragments is that of Jordan. Note that some fragments (like *De medicina* fr. 1 and 2) contain no reference-formulae and they are omitted altogether.

[*De medicina*]

- fr. 3. Diomedes 1.362.22 K: *Cato ad filium vel de oratore*  
 fr. 4. (a) Priscianus 2.268.19 K: *Cato ad filium*  
 fr. 4. (b) Priscianus 2.337.5 K: *Cato in epistola ad filium*  
 fr. 5. Plinius *NH* 7.171: ... *Censorius Cato ad filium ... prodiderit*

[*De agri cultura*]

- fr. 6. Servius Auctus ad *Georg.* 1.46. *Cato in oratione ad filium ...*<sup>52</sup>  
 fr. 7. Nonius 143.4 M 208 L *Cato in praeceptis ad filium*  
 fr. 8. Servius ad *Georg.* 2.95. *Cato ... laudat in libris quos scripsit ad filium*  
 fr. 9. Servius ad *Georg.* 2.412. *Cato ait in libris ad filium de agri cultura*<sup>53</sup>

[*De rhetorica*]

- fr. 16. Marius Victorinus. In *Rhet.* Cic. II p. 178 Or. ... *in hanc rem constat etiam Catonis praeceptum divinum*

Since Mazzarino's work these discrepancies have become a strong argument against the theory of the Encyclopedic Collection. Mazzarino pointed out that in fr. 3 a medical prescript was given under the title *de oratore*. It could be inferred that Cato had not arranged his advice strictly according to subject matter. Mazzarino, following Jahn, identified this work with the *Praecepta ad filium* referred to at fr. 7.<sup>54</sup> Astin, whose arguments are examined more closely below, in general accepted Mazzarino's view and described the work of Cato as 'a collection, probably in one book, of precepts, exhortations, instructions and observations'.<sup>55</sup> Both Mazzarino and Astin concurred with Jahn's most important statement, namely that the passages on medicine were to be united with the other fragments not related to medicine. But it is precisely this presumption that must be challenged.

## 2.2. Fragments 8, 9, and 5.

To start with the most difficult case, I examine fragments 8 and 9 of the *libri De agri cultura ad filium*. Astin commented on this title: '... *de agricultura* refers to the subject

---

Latin poetry, Schröder's book is to be consulted for further bibliography). For wider semiotic context see G. Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge, 1997 (originally published in French, 1987). However, the concept of *paratext* offered by Genette only obliquely touches the phenomenon of reference-formulae. As a kind of 'micro-text' incorporated into a larger text, a reference-formula retains considerable autonomy, which lead to linguistic and textological problems discussed below in this paper.

<sup>52</sup> Corr. *de aratione* Jahn (see n. 1), 268, n. \*.

<sup>53</sup> The following fragments of the *Ad filium* are included in F. Speranza, *Scriptorum Romanorum De re rustica reliquiae*, Vol. 1, Messina, 1974: fr. 6 = 1 Speranza, fr. 8 = 3 Speranza, fr. 9 = 2 Speranza.

<sup>54</sup> Mazzarino (see n. 4), 26-28. Compare, however Jahn (see n. 1), 228, who offered the same argument in support of his theory of the Encyclopedia.

<sup>55</sup> Astin (see n. 1), 339.

not of the book but only of this particular fragment, which is how one must interpret the similar *de validis ad filium* with which Pliny *NH* 7.171 designates a fragment usually assigned to the supposed *De medicina ...*. Astin argued that the genuine title must have been no longer than *Ad filium* itself. All the variants like *de medicina*, *de agri cultura* or *de oratore* should be recognized as reflections of independent attempts to describe the miscellaneous content of Cato's book.

The LCL translation by Rackham will clearly show the difficulty with the text in question:

*NH* 7.171: *et cum innumerabilia sint mortis signa, salutis securitatisque nulla sunt, quippe cum censorius Cato ad filium de validis quoque observationem ut ex oraculo aliquo prodiderit, senilem iuventam praematurae mortis esse signum.*

And whereas the signs of death are innumerable, there are no signs of health being secure; inasmuch as the ex-censor Cato gave an apparently oracular utterance addressed to his son about healthy persons also, to the effect that senile characteristics in youth are a sign of premature death

This translation rests on the reasonable assumption that the clause *Cato ad filium de validis observationem prodiderit* forms a coherent syntactical construction with a reference to Cato's work, but no specific utterance is used for the title proper. For the purpose of the present study, I shall call this kind of utterance a (*grammatically*) *absorbed reference*.

Astin's understanding of *NH* 7.171 is based upon entirely different underlying grammatical structures. It would imply a translation such as the following: *Cato testified (in the work labeled) AD FILIUM DE VALIDIS that ...* If we accept this interpretation we find that syntactical structure of the sentence must be changed: *de validis* is not connected to *prodiderit*,<sup>56</sup> and the title is excluded from the construction and forms a kind of parenthesis (in a modern text a foot-note would be expected). The phrase still remains superficially coherent. I call this type of reference an *embedded title*.

An embedded reference cannot be distinguished from an absorbed one on purely linguistic grounds. Whenever a sentence can be satisfactorily explained as a normal syntactical structure, an embedded reference is to be identified only a posteriori.

Another type may be called an *explicit* reference. It is not masked within standard syntax. Explicit references are widely used by later writers, e.g.:

Nonius 77.13 M 108 L: *Varro Cato vel de liberis educandis*

<sup>56</sup> It is important to consider the grammatical shift transforming a prepositional phrase connected to a verb phrase (typical of Classical Latin) to that connected to a noun phrase (for this problem see P. De Carvalho, 'Le nouveau dans l'ancien: adjective vs préposition + substantif en latin (*templum de marmore ponam* Vergilius *Georgica* 3.13)', in L. Sawicki, D. Shalev, (eds.), *Donum grammaticum: Studies in Latin and Celtic Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén*, Leuven, 2002 (Orbis. Supplementa; 18), 77-87. It is worth noticing that *liber de* appears to be one of the earliest cases of a prepositional phrase not connected to a verb: Cic. *Off.* 2.16: *Est Dicaearchi liber de interitu hominum*. Still, Cicero preferred references of the absorbed/embedded type, like *Tusc.*4.1: *in is sex libris, quos de re publica scripsimus*.

Gellius 6 (7). 11.9: *P. Africanus pro se contra Tiberium Asellum de multa ad populum.*

The last example shows an odd non-grammatical chain of prepositional phrases. In the case of *NH* 7.171 it is not immediately clear whether Pliny uses an absorbed reference (as implied by Rackham's translation), or an embedded reference is involved, which Astin read as *Ad filium de validis*. Moreover, I think that both Astin and Rackham were partially right. Consider the following passage from the *Naturalis Historia*:

*NH* 2.117: *viginti amplius auctores Graeci veteres prodidere de his observationes.*

Pliny never uses the verb *prodere* in the sense 'to give something to somebody' and, for this reason, *prodere* is never tied to an indication of an addressee.<sup>57</sup> Consequently, against Rackham's translation, *Cato ad filium observationem prodiderit* is not to be understood as 'Cato gave an *observatio* to his son'. The phrase *ad filium* must be separated from the verb *prodere*, which means 'to testify', 'to inform', 'to report', an expression very frequently used by Pliny when he relies on some authority. On the other hand Astin is probably wrong in separating *de validis* from *observationem*. The phrase *observatio de* (*NH* 2.117) is an occasional variant of the phrase with the genitive, widely used in the *Naturalis Historia*,<sup>58</sup> other possible prepositional constructions being *super omnia una observatio* (*NH* 31.39), or *circa id observationes* (*NH*, Praef. Index lib. 11).

I would like to argue, then, that at *NH* 7.171 the embedded title AD FILIUM is used: *Cato reported (in the work labeled) AD FILIUM an observation about healthy persons*. The actual use of the embedded title could apply the title AD FILIUM in explicit reference-formulae when quoting Cato verbatim.

A superficial similarity of absorbed references and embedded titles may cause grave problems.

Thus, fr. 8 in its entirety appears to be semantically ambivalent, since it may be understood as

(1) 'he wrote the books addressed to his son' with the expression *ad filium* syntactically connected to the verb and consequently forming an absorbed reference,

or

(2) 'he wrote the books (labeled) AD FILIUM', with *ad filium* as an embedded title.

The situation, however, is not hopeless, for the usage of Roman grammarians decidedly supports the second interpretation. To show this phenomenon properly I shall consider more closely reference-formulae built on the pattern *ad filium*. The best attested

<sup>57</sup> P. Rosumek, N. Dietmar, *Concordantia in C. Plinii Secundi Naturalem historiam*, Hildesheim, 1996, s.v. *prodere*, I have also used the data of Packard Humanity Institute CD 5. In case of Pliny, the dative of an addressee is expected: H. Pinkster, 'The Language of Pliny the Elder', in T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, J.N. Adams, edd., *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, Oxford, 2005, 242, but *ad filium* as a designation of an addressee is not in itself suspect. This construction is registered in the article AD, *ThLL* 1, 512, 30: '(E) *cum verbis scribendi, nuntiandi, deferendi, clamandi, dicendi*', and found e.g. in *NH* 25.6: *ad illum ... volumina composita extant*.

<sup>58</sup> E.g. *NH* 2.35: *observatio umbrarum eius*.

examples of this type are the various references to quotations from the *De lingua Latina* of Varro.

The reference *Varro ait ad Ciceronem* (5.584.27 K) does not mean 'Varro says to Cicero', but 'Varro says in (the book labeled) AD CICERONEM'. Likewise *Varro vero de lingua Latina ait* (2.333.12 K) — 'Varro says in (the book labeled) DE LINGUA LATINA. This pattern is quite common and grammarians freely give a title containing a preposition near a verb without danger of being ambiguous, although a prepositional phrase could theoretically make an absorbed reference.

The addressee-only pattern of book title, like AD CICERONEM <numerus>, is the only one adopted by Charisius and Diomedes,<sup>59</sup> and is widely used, if not preferred, by the other grammarians. It is clear that this addressee-only title is an abridged form of a full title in which the name of addressee was combined with an indication of subject matter. One may plausibly postulate four diachronic stages of this development. The first, or better, the zero stage would be DE LINGUA LATINA, a prepositional phrase connected directly not with a verb but with a noun (a typical absorbed reference). Varro himself used it: *Ling.* 7.110: *omnis operis de lingua Latina tris feci partis* 'I composed three parts of the whole work, (dealing) with the Latin language', but not 'the work (labeled) DE LINGUA LATINA'. The earliest form of the title proper, developed from the quasi-title of the zero stage, would be the reference-formula LIBRI (LIBER) DE LINGUA LATINA. The next form must have been the amplified LIBRI (LIBER) DE LINGUA LATINA AD CICERONEM. This form produced the title LIBRI (LIBER) AD CICERONEM, which was the last to come into use. When quoting the *De lingua latina* Gellius knew only the first two forms, and all his references are of the embedded type:<sup>60</sup>

- 6.11.8 (L.10.80): *M. Varro in libris de lingua Latina ... inquit ...*  
 10.21.2 (L.6.59): *...verbis ipsius Varronis ex libro de lingua Latina ad Ciceronem sexto demonstrandum putavi*  
 2.25.5:<sup>61</sup> *M. Varronis liber <ad> Ciceronem de lingua Latina octavus ... docet*  
 16.8.6:<sup>62</sup> *Sed M. Varro in libro de lingua Latina ad Ciceronem quarto vicesimo expeditissime ita finit*

The corpus of Servius' Commentaries is of particular interest, because it provides three *Ad filium* fragments (frr. 6, 8, 9). It shows a different way of quoting Varro. The only example of subject-matter-and-addressee title is the explicit non-grammatical reference:<sup>63</sup>

Servius Auctus in *Aen.*1.505 (L. 5.161): *idem Varro de lingua Latina ad Ciceronem.*

<sup>59</sup> The only exception being 73.1 B. 1.58.17 K *mensam sine N littera Varo ait* (cf. L. 5.118), but this quotation does not exactly match the text of Varro.

<sup>60</sup> Precisely the same is the situation with Varro's *De sermone Latino ad Marcellum*: Gell.12.6.3 = fr. 35 Funaioli 16 Traglia, Gell.12.10.4 = fr. 34 Funaioli 17 Traglia, Gell.16.12.7 = fr. 36 Funaioli 18 Traglia, Gell. 18.12.8 = fr. 45 Funaioli 50 Traglia.

<sup>61</sup> *Lib.* 8, fr. 41, p. 146 Goetz-Schoell, fr. 11 Funaioli.

<sup>62</sup> *Lib.* 24, fr. 29, p.196 Goetz-Schoell, fr. 22 Funaioli.

<sup>63</sup> The title DE LINGUA LATINA is probably used in the corrupted scholion of Servius Auctus on *Georg.*1.75 (fr. 31 Funaioli). The concise list of the quotations from Varro in the Servius corpus is given by R.B. Lloyd, 'Republican Authors in Servius and the Scholia Danielis', *HSCP*, 65, 1961, 309-313.

The other references contain the addressee-only title in various guises:

- Servius in *Aen.* 5.409: *Varro in libris ad Ciceronem*  
 Servius Auctus in *Aen.* 1.43: *Varro ad Ciceronem*  
 Servius Auctus in *Aen.* 12.139: *Varro ad Ciceronem tertio*  
 Servius Auctus in *Georg.* 1.11: *sed Varro ad Ciceronem ita ait*  
 Servius Auctus in *Georg.* 3.431:<sup>64</sup> *Varro ad Ciceronem in libro xxiii ... inquit.*

We can see that the variety of the reported titles of Cato's *Ad filium* cannot be explained by the theory embraced both by Mazzarino and Astin. We could surmise that a full form \**Ad filium de <\*\*\*>* had gone out of use and therefore it is not attested in our sources. However, one would predict constant use of the simple *Ad filium*. As we have seen, Roman grammarians freely used addressee-only titles (supposedly because of their brevity), and no difficulties ever arose from quoting the title *Ad filium*, nor would this addressee-only title generate something like *oratio ad filium* and the other odd formulae attested by our sources.

The addressee-only title of fr. 8 appears to be convincingly explained by the truncation of the title used in fr. 9. Yet the context of fr. 8 is far more complicated.

Servius on *Georg.* 2.95:

QVO TE CARMINE DICAM RHAETICA. *hanc uvam. Cato praecipue laudat in libris, quos scripsit ad filium; contra Catullus<sup>65</sup> eam vituperat et dicit nulli rei esse aptam, miraturque cur eam laudaverit Cato. sciens ergo utrumque Vergilius medium tenuit, dicens 'quo te carmine dicam Rhaetica?'*

What does this mean?

First of all, we must recognize that there is no quotation from 'Cato' here. Servius reported the opinion of 'Catullus' on the judgment 'Cato' made about the *Rhaetica* grape. It is difficult to believe that somebody undertook the painful work of finding a relevant context in the original writings of 'Cato' in order to ultimately exclude it from his commentary. 'Catullus', then, appears to be the only source for that *Cato praecipue laudat*. But how could Servius know that Cato really did praise a special kind of grape *in libris, quos scripsit ad filium*? Besides *Georg.* 2.95, there are five scholia on the *Aeneid*, in which Servius refers to a poet Catullus.<sup>66</sup> This Catullus and our *poeta Veronensis* are probably one and the same person. But a poet Catullus, whoever he was, would hardly have made any direct reference to the *libri ad filium* in his poem.

The solution to this riddle comes from the context of fr. 9, Servius on *Georg.* 2.412:

LAVDATO INGENTIA RVRA EXIGVVM COLITO *hoc etiam Cato ait in libris ad filium de agricultura...*

<sup>64</sup> Fr. 28, 10, 6 Funaioli, L.7.36, and fr. 21 Funaioli.

<sup>65</sup> Fr. 8 Lachmann 5 Blänsdorf. For a presumed prose work of Catullus see the references in R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus*, Oxford, 1889, 506. From *uva Rhaetica* or *Raetica* a local wine was produced in the region of Verona.

<sup>66</sup> Catull. fr. 6 Lachmann, Serv. *ad Aen.* 5.591 : *est autem versus Catulli*, this commentary explains the 'borrowing' made by Virgil, while the other scholia deal with grammatical questions like the gender of *pumex* (Catull. *Carm.*1.2, Serv. *ad Aen.* 12.787): fr. 10 Lachmann, Serv. *ad Aen.* 4.409; fr. 11 Lachmann Serv. *ad Aen.* 5.610; fr. 12 Lachmann, Serv. *ad Aen.* 7.378.

We see that commentaries on both *Georg.* 2.95 and *Georg.* 2.412 are focused on the verb *laudare*. The scholion on *Georg.* 2.412 implies that some dictum similar in wording to that in Virgil's *laudato* was found in the books believed to be written by Cato Censorius. The commentary on *Georg.* 2.95 makes it probable that the name 'Cato' appeared in the original text of Catullus. The phrase *miraturque cur eam laudaverit Cato* seems to closely render the original of Catullus.<sup>67</sup> In any case, *laudare* is a key-word in Servius' commentary.

This interpretation is strongly supported by Nonius Marcellus who inserted in his Dictionary the lemma LAUDARE *est verbis ecficere* 335.10 M 528 L, which begins with the same dictum of Virgil.

One may infer from these correspondences that a common source for Nonius' LAUDARE article and Servius' scholia on *Georg.* 2.95 and 2.412 was a philological, or rather rhetorical, treatise concerned with the theme of praising and illustrated with a series of quotations.

I adduce further arguments in favor of this hypothesis.

Nonius states (335.12 M 528 L) that *laudare* means *nominare*, and explains *Georg.* 3.5 *inlaudati Busiridis* as *id est nec nominandi*, which does not fit the text of Virgil, but is quite successful in explaining Plaut. *Capt.* 426 (also quoted by Nonius):

*id ut scias, Iovem supremum testem laudo, Hegio.*<sup>68</sup>

It appears that Nonius confused two meanings of the verb *laudare* registered in his article: *verbis ecficere*, and *nominare*, and only the first one is suitable for *Georg.* 3.5. The origin of this mistake may be found in our text of Servius' commentary, where *inlaudati Busiridis* is explained as a hint at the praise of Busiris by Isocrates. This commentary is supported by a further grammatical note:

*unde 'inlaudati' participium est pro nomine, ut sit inlaudabilis, non 'qui laudatus non sit', sed 'qui laudari non meruerit'.*

I think that Nonius' wrong interpretation of *Georg.* 3.5 came from misunderstanding the scholion reported by Servius, and the phrase *est pro nomine* forced Nonius to list *Georg.* 3.5 under the entry *etiam significat nominare*.

Due to the ingenious discovery of W.M. Lindsay we have an idea of how the relevant part of Nonius' work was compiled.<sup>69</sup> Nonius quotes his authorities in the following order: (1) *Virg.Georg.* 2.412, (2) *Virg.Georg.* 3.5 and (3) *Plaut.Capt.* 426, but the starting point was the gloss to *Plaut.Capt.* 426 taken by Nonius from his copy of the plays of Plautus (*Plautus* I = *Catalogus* 2 Lindsay). The other entries for the letter L in Book 4 (covered by pages 333-335 of Mercerus' edition) initially came from the same source.<sup>70</sup> To these *initial quotations* from *Plautus* I additional examples were added from other poets. When arranging a whole article Nonius generally began with an entry exposing what he believed to be the normal meaning, and this he illustrated by examples mostly from Virgil. Nonius had a manuscript of Virgil at his disposal, but now we can

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Catull. 110.1: *laudantur*; 22.17: *miratur*.

<sup>68</sup> W.M. Lindsay, *The Captivi of Plautus*, London, 1900, 224, cf. Gell. 2.6.16, and *ThLL*.7.2.1046.40.

<sup>69</sup> Lindsay (see n. 51), 37, n. 'b'.

<sup>70</sup> Lindsay (see n. 51), 72.



see that for the article LAUDARE he borrowed quotations from a grammatical source which also happened to be used by Servius.<sup>71</sup> The difference between Servius and Nonius in treating this source must not be overlooked. Nonius attached the quotations from Virgil to the lemma, in which the normal meaning of the verb *laudare* was stated. Servius did not address the normal meaning. He was showing how some curious instances of praising could clarify three verses of the Georgics:

*Georg.* 2.95: Catullus discarded Cato's praise for the *Rhaetica* grape, but Virgil had both judgments in mind;

*Georg.* 2.412: Virgil borrowed from Cato the dictum *laudato ingentia rura*;

*Georg.* 3.5: Virgil discarded Isocrates' praise for Busiris.

I would like to argue that in their original form these three commentaries were thematically interrelated and that they entered into a coherent text. The particular importance of this reconstruction lies in the possibility of explaining the reference-formula of fr. 8. It seems plausible that it was transferred from the commentary on *Georg.* 2.412. A compiler collecting the examples of praise learned from a commentary to *Georg.* 2.412 that Cato Censorius had written the *libri ad filium de agri cultura*, where he had praised *ingentia rura*. When the compiler encountered in one of Catullus' poems an allusion to 'Cato' having praised the *Rhaetica* grape, he decided that this 'Cato' was Cato Censorius, and that the work criticized by Catullus was just the same *libri ad filium de agri cultura*.

As I have argued before, no reference to Cato's work could have been found in the poem by Catullus, nor could it have been borrowed from an earlier commentary on Catullus, precisely because Catullus had never been an object of any commentary.<sup>72</sup> This means that the reference-formula of fr. 8 was interpolated. After the interpolation was made, the context of the quotation changed dramatically and the ghost of Cato the Elder was evoked. But it is not even likely that Catullus aimed at the author of the *libri ad filium de agri cultura*. It would be puzzling if Catullus were implicated in a voluminous technical work on agriculture written as far back as a century beforehand. Catullus would mention his contemporary rather than Cato Censorius. He addressed the obscene *Carm.* 56 to some Cato, but nothing proves that this gentleman was either a poet or a scholar. Yet the polemics about the quality of the *uva Rhaetica* in which Catullus was involved could hardly be imagined beyond the literary milieu of the *poetae novi*. Consequently, the Cato referred to in fr. 8. may be plausibly identified as Valerius Cato.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>71</sup> It must be emphasized that the agreement between Nonius and Servius is an isolated phenomenon. Nonius collected many quotations from Virgil in the *Plautus* I segment of the Letter L (except for the lemma *Laudare*): *Liqui Georg.* 2.187, *Aen.* 2.187, 3.28; *Lustrare Aen.* 3.651; *Aen.* 8.231; *Ecl.* 2.12; *Aen.* 4.6; *Aen.* 8.152-153, but only in the last case is Nonius' gloss close to that of Servius.

<sup>72</sup> But Catullus was an object of interest to Roman grammarians. Leaving aside metrical treatises, Catullus was quoted by Pliny: *Dubius sermo*: fr. 27 Della Casa 89 Mazzarino; cf. E. Zaffagnio, 'Catullo in Nonio Marcello', *Studi Noniani*, 3, 1975, 257-263.

<sup>73</sup> On Valerius Cato see A.S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 B.C. - A.D. 20*, Oxford, 2007, 419; for the Cato of *Carm.* 56 identified as Cato Minor: Ellis (see n. 65), 196-198, and W.C. Scott, 'Catullus and Cato', *CPh*, 64, 1969, pp.24-29.

## 2.3. Fragment 3.

Fr. 3, Diomedes I 362.22 K: *Cato ad filium †vel de oratore†: lepus multum somni adfert qui illum edit.*

It is well established that Plutarch *Cat. Mai.* 23 350d had paraphrased the same Latin text as Diomedes quoted.<sup>74</sup>

τρέφων δὲ λαχάνοις καὶ σαρκιδίοις νήσσης ἢ φαβὸς ἢ λαγῶ· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτον κοῦφον εἶναι καὶ πρόσφορον ἀσθινοῦσι, πλὴν ὅτι πολλὰ συμβαίνει τοῖς φαγοῦσιν ἐνυπνιάζεσθαι.

Leo reasonably commented on this passage when claiming that the words *πολλὰ ἐνυπνιάζεσθαι*, 'to have a lot of dreams', were a misreading of the phrase *multum somni adfert qui illum edit*.<sup>75</sup> Comparing the Greek version and the text attested by Diomedes, we also note that *τοῦτον* is deliberately ambiguous, for it seems to refer to an entire inventory of healthy food rather than to focus exclusively on *λαγῶς*; yet it is only the hare who is responsible for sleepiness in the Latin text. This ambiguity may indicate that Plutarch was not sure about the exact sense of the Latin original. It would be odd if Cato had warned orators about eating hare in order to prevent them from falling asleep, and the context in which Plutarch quotes this passage clearly indicates that it goes back to the medical *Ad filium*. Why, then, does the quotation refer to *de oratore*? I have already observed that this surprising title had become the main argument for the theory of a miscellaneous didactic treatise advanced by Mazzarino and Astin (§ 2.1). On this point I would prefer to argue that the reference-formula of fr. 3 is corrupt.

Plutarch reports that Cato used hare meat to cure weakness or *adynamia*: *πρόσφορον ἀσθινοῦσι*. A possible Latin rendering is found in Celsus' *De medicina* 4.10.4:

*utilis etiam in omni tussi est peregrinatio... cibus interdum mollis...*

I think that *utilis in* may lie behind the corrupt *vel de...* The corruption itself can be explained paleographically if we take into account the ancient abbreviation *Ū*, which could be read either *vel* or *ut*.<sup>76</sup>

One cannot unequivocally assert which Latin utterance was translated by Plutarch as *ἀσθινοῦσι*. A closely corresponding parallel is the clause *qui debilis erit*, found in Cato's *De agri cultura* 157.10 where the medicine is not hare meat, but cabbage. If some

<sup>74</sup> The same passage is also paraphrased by Pliny *NH* 28.260: *somnos fieri lepore sumpto in cibis Cato arbitrabatur*. This passage is unambiguous, so it is not likely that it was a direct source for the erroneous translation. Plutarch believed that some kinds of food caused dreams: *Quomodo adulescens* 1 15b, see W.V. Harris, *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass., 2009, 193.

<sup>75</sup> Leo (see n. 12), 279, n. 1, and Astin (see n. 1), 335, n. 6. I think that Leo was wrong in arguing that Pliny was Plutarch's source for the note about hare meat (and Leo believed that Pliny had quoted Cato's *letter*), while Diomedes had taken the same prescript from Cato's *book*. — Plutarch knew Latin, but it is not easy to establish which Latin sources he used directly; the evidence is summarized by A. Strobach, *Plutarch und die Sprachen. Ein Beitrag zur Fremdsprachenproblematik in der Antike*, Stuttgart, 1997, 32-46; see also J. Geiger, 'A Quotation from Latin in Plutarch?', *CQ*, 52, 2002, 632-634.

<sup>76</sup> W.M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae ...*, Cambridge, 1915, 311, 320. A similar error emerges e.g. in Apuleius *Flor.* 9 (11, 4 Helm): *utilitas* mss. for *vilitas*.

letters of the original word are hidden in the meaningless ORATORE, then one could think about *languore* or *torpore*. Both words are lacking in the extant texts of Cato, but both are attested in the Latin of the second century BCE: the former was first used by Plautus, the latter is known since Lucilius.<sup>77</sup> Consequently I would reconstruct the whole quotation of Diomedes as follows:

(\*) *Cato ad filium: <utilis in languore> lepus, multum somni adfert qui illum edit.*<sup>78</sup>

The elimination of *vel de* is supported by noting that the reference-formulae of VEL DE (or AUT DE) type are extremely rare.<sup>79</sup> This formula implies that a title is a compound made of two semantically independent parts, which would not be a case of *Ad filium vel de* ....

#### 2.4. Fragments 4, 11, 12.

Fr. 4. (a) Priscianus 2.268.19 K: *Cato ad filium: ex dolore ex febris ex siti ex medicamentis bibendis ex cataplasmatis ex alveo lavando*

Fr. 4. (b) Priscianus 2.337.5 K: *Cato in epistola ad filium: ex dolore — lavando*

Mazzarino suggested that Priscian had borrowed these quotations from the *Dubius sermo*, Pliny's great grammatical work.<sup>80</sup> The present study supports this claim. We have already seen that *NH* 7.171 contains the embedded title *Ad filium*. It seems probable that during work on the *Dubius sermo* Pliny had access to the full text of Cato's letter and made excerpts from it with the reference-formula *Ad filium*. Later, he inserted a long quotation from the *Ad filium* into the *Naturalis Historia* (fr. 1, 2), along with smaller quotations and paraphrases (fr. 3, 5). If this is true, the *Dubius sermo* is expected to have been the only source for quotations with the reference-formula (*Cato*) *ad filium*.

There is clear evidence that examples from Cato's *Ad filium* quoted by Priscian (fr. 4) and Diomedes (fr. 3) depended ultimately on the grammatical treatise of Pliny.

In fr. 4(a) Priscian focuses on the grammatical gender of *alveus*, and in fr. 4 (b) he discussed the inflection of the nouns *febris* and *sitis* found in the same quotation. Both grammatical topics were treated by Pliny;<sup>81</sup> therefore a borrowing from his *Dubius Sermo* seems probable. At this point I would surmise that two different reference-formulae used by Priscian may be traced back to different entries in the *Dubius sermo*.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Turpilius v. 78 Rychlewska: *torporavit*.

<sup>78</sup> Compare this asyndeton with e.g. *Cat. Agr.* 157.3: *cancer ater, is olet et saniem spurcam mittit, albus purulentus est, sed fistulosus et subtus suppurat sub carne*.

<sup>79</sup> There are only six instances in the Gellius' work: 3.10.1 *M. Varro in primo librorum, qui inscribuntur Hebdomades vel de imaginibus*; 4.19.2: *M. Varro in logistorico scripsit, qui inscriptus est Catus aut de liberis educandis* (but Nonius 77.13 M 108 L: *Varro Cato vel de liberis educandis*); 13.4.1: *in libro M. Varronis, qui inscriptus est Orestes vel de insania*; 16.9.5: *M. Varro in Sisenna vel de historia*; 17.5.1: *M. Cicero in dialogo, cui titulus est Laelius vel de amicitia*; Gell. 17.18: *M. Varro ... in libro, quem scripsit Pius aut de pace*. This list includes all works of Varro for which the VEL (AUT) DE formula is attested.

<sup>80</sup> Mazzarino (see n. 4), 28.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. fr. 10 Mazzarino 5 Della Casa, and fr. 71-90 Mazzarino 17-38, 46 Della Casa, on the case inflections studied by Pliny, see A. Della Casa, *Il Dubius Sermo di Plinio*, Genova, 1969, 64.

Fr. 3 presents a similar case. Diomedes cited it as an example of the verbal form *edit*. But there is also the word *somnium* in the quotation, and we know that Pliny dwelt upon the family *somnium* ~ *insomnium* ~ *insomnia*.<sup>82</sup> Most likely fr. 3 was originally quoted by Pliny in two different entries of the *Dubius sermo*, and the supposed quotation in the article on *somnium* was a probable direct source for Plutarch, who was misled by this dubious word.

Two fragments of the *Ad filium* are quoted by Plutarch as maxims of Cato. In both cases the Greek text can be retranslated such that a Latin utterance would be the focus of a grammatical commentary.

fr. 12, *Cat. Mai.* 21 349c: προτρέπων δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ἐπὶ ταῦτα, φησὶν οὐκ ἀνδρός, ἀλλὰ χήρας γυναικὸς εἶναι τὸ μειῶσαί τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων.

The voice of Cato is clearly heard in the phrase οὐκ ἀνδρός, ἀλλὰ χήρας γυναικὸς εἶναι, presumably rendering (\*) *non viri sed viduae*. The grammatical focus, however, could lie in the phrase τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, which certainly translated the Latin *fortuna*. This word is generally treated as *plurale tantum* in the sense 'property'.<sup>83</sup> Charisius duly inserted the gloss *fortuna bona ὑπάρχοντα οὐσία* in his long list of the feminine *pluralia tantum* (35.25 B 1.33, 4.13 K; cf. Diomedes 1.328.1 K). Again, the grammatical topic of fr. 12 is very close to the one associated with fr. 3, where the distinction between *insomnia* feminine singular and *insomnia* neuter plural is in question.

Fr. 11, *Cat. Mai.* 4.338f κτᾶσθαι δὲ τὰ σπειρόμενα καὶ νεμόμενα μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ ῥαινόμενα καὶ σαιρόμενα.

The second couple, ῥαινόμενα καὶ σαιρόμενα, corresponds exactly to the expression *vorsa sparsa*<sup>84</sup> attested by Plautus, *Pseud.* 163-164:

*haec, quom ego a foro revortar, facite ut offendam parata,  
vorsa sparsa, tersa strata, lautaque unctaque omnia ut sint.*

Servius *Aen.* 1.59 and Diomedes 1.379.20 K quote *Pseud.* 164 as an example of the rare derivation *verror* – *versus*.<sup>85</sup> Thus, fr. 11 is put into a grammatical context.

While the dependence of Plutarch on the *Dubius sermo* seems to be a plausible supposition, there are grave difficulties in ascribing fr. 11 and 12 to a specific work by Cato. Plutarch was not accurate in reporting the reference-formulae, which certainly were attached to the original Latin quotations. In fact, a reference-formula is omitted in fr. 11, and in fr. 12 we have an utterance which is very uncertain: προτρέπων δὲ τὸν υἱὸν

<sup>82</sup> *Dubius sermo* fr. 13 Mazzarino 15 Della Casa = Serv. *Aen.* 4.9 (indicating Pliny by name, = Ennius *Inc.* 25 Vahlen, Pacuvius fr. 9 Ribb. 303 Schierl, Charisius 129.5 B 1.101.17 K = Pacuvius fr. 9 Ribb. 303 Schierl, and the commentary of Della Casa (see n. 81), 210.

<sup>83</sup> *ThLL* 6.1, 1177, 58; 1179, 81.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. *verro* σαίρω Charisius 320.13 B 1.246.9 K.

<sup>85</sup> Ch. F. Neue, C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Bd. 3, Berlin, 1897, 565; see also Servius ad *Aen.* 1.59. Diomedes 1.379.20 K quotes *vorsa sparsa* under the entry *De his quae perfectum tempus non habent*. For the meaning of ῥαινόμενα καὶ σαιρόμενα, something like 'smooth and cleaned', see also Cato *Agr.* 143.2: *villam conversam mundamque habeat*.

... φησὶν ... It could be a translation of *ad filium ait*,<sup>86</sup> to which Plutarch added the participle προτρέπων describing the moralistic nature of Cato's saying. However, another Latin title resembles the Greek formula more closely:

fr. 7, Nonius 143.4 M 208 L: *Cato in praeceptis ad filium...*

This reference-formula clearly shows that Nonius dealt with the title *Praecepta ad filium*. But this title could be recognized as synonymous with (*Epistola*) *ad filium*, only if we accept the theory of a large miscellaneous treatise, which I am trying to refute.

The suggestion that while writing the *Life of Cato Major*, Plutarch was bearing on a Latin grammatical source, is indeed controversial, and is worth considering here briefly. It is well established that Plutarch's acquaintance with Cato's works was quite restricted,<sup>87</sup> but (along with others) he might have relied on a collection of Cato's *Apophthegmata*. It is generally accepted that witty, moralistic, or practical maxims had been excerpted from Cato's writings by an unknown compiler (or compilers), and later Plutarch inserted some of these aphorisms into his own text.<sup>88</sup> I do not tend towards discarding this theory, and my alternative view is that for *some* of his Latin quotations Plutarch drew on a collection (or collections) of grammatical examples. Plutarch himself was a man of letters, and he began to learn Latin when in his fifties along with his work on the *Vitae*.<sup>89</sup> It would be safe to infer, therefore, that at that time he was deeply steeped in books on Latin grammar, and that he could draw on relevant material from these books in a literary work of his own.

#### 2.4. Fragment 6.

Servius ad Virg. *Georg.* 1.46: ATTRITUS SPLENDESCERE VOMER.

Lucretius (1.314) "*oculto decrescit vomer in arvo*": {*quod evenire frequenti aratione novimus, ut et splendidior fiat et teratur: Cato in oratione ad filium "vir bonus est, Marce fili, colendi peritus, cuius ferramenta splendent"*} *dicimus autem et hic vomer et hic vomis, sed ab utroque huius vomeris facit.*

Curly brackets {} mark the text of *Servius Auctus*, the text of fr. 6 itself is in bold.

Tied to a definition of a good ploughman, the reference *in oratione* looks illogical, and furthermore a speech addressed to the son of an orator is hardly possible. This case at first glance is similar to the corrupt *de oratore* in fr. 3. But the resemblance, striking as it may seem, is a mere accident. It will emerge from this section of my paper that the whole of fr. 6 is a forgery.

In his note on *Georg.* 1.46, Servius explains *attritus* 'diminished by abrasion' quoting Lucretius 1.314.

<sup>86</sup> The verb *ait* is the most common reference-tool of Roman grammarians. It is employed in fragments 9 (discussed above), and 13 (Seneca *De benef.* 5.7.6), 14 (Seneca *Contr.* 1 *praef.* 9), 15 (Iulius Victor *Art. rhet.* 1 p. 374.15 Halm).

<sup>87</sup> H. Klapp, *De vitarum Plutarchearum auctoribus Romanis*, Bonnae, 1862, is still valuable.

<sup>88</sup> These 'sayings by Cato' are to be distinguished from a collection of aphorisms of famous Greeks and Romans, which circulated under the name of Cato as compiler; see O. Rossi, 'De M. Catonis dictis et apophthegmatis' *Athenaeum*, 2, 1924, 174-782.

<sup>89</sup> Strobach (see n. 75), 34, assumes that Plutarch was learning Latin intensively about AD 100 'in the stillness of his native town'.

In the second commentary of Servius the grammatical focus is on the variance *vomis* ~ *vomer*. We find this couple to be of interest to a commentator of Virgil, because in *Georg.* 1.162 the alternative form *vomis* occurs. On this line Servius has a commentary in which grammatical peculiarities of *vomis* are discussed, and the commentary on *Georg.* 1.46 is evidently an abridgment of that on *Georg.* 1.162.

*Servius Auctus* focuses on the notion of a ploughshare becoming 'splendid' through intensive use. This commentary is interpolated immediately after *Lucr.* 1.314, and is followed by Cato's saying, which seems to be inconsistent with the sense of Lucretius' line, because Lucretius was concerned only with diminishing (see the whole passage of the *De rerum natura* 1.311-319) but he did not mention glitter as a sign of diminishing. His three examples, indeed, are metal things: *anulus*, *uncus aratri ferreus*, *aenea signa*, but I doubt that *Servius Auctus* took into account the wider context of *Lucr.* 1.314. In fact, the notion of diminishing is not necessarily implicated either in the commentary or in the dictum of Cato.

Isidore of Seville (*Orig.* 20.14.1) treats *Lucr.* 1.314 in a way similar to that in *Servius Auctus*. After quoting the verse of Lucretius, he says about the ploughshare: *sumitque per detrimenta fulgorem*.<sup>90</sup> Isidore uses the word *fulgor*, not *splendor*, the keyword in the commentary of *Servius Auctus*. It follows that Isidore does not have in mind either *Georg.* 1.46 (*splendescere*) or the *Ad filium* (*splendent*), and he did not know the commentary on *Georg.* 1.46, reported by *Servius Auctus*. Rather, the latter drew on Isidore for his commentary.<sup>91</sup> But the source for the saying of Cato still remains uncertain. We have to acknowledge that in Late Antiquity or in the age of Isidore a grammarian could still have had access to a quotation from Cato otherwise unknown to us. The fragment, however, is itself suspect. Did Cato really coin a series of uniform definitions for *vir bonus* being in some respect *peritus*?<sup>92</sup> His famous dictum *orator est, Marci fili, vir bonus dicendi peritus* became a standard school definition doubtless known to all men of learning in the late Empire.<sup>93</sup> We will now compare the phrase *ut splendidior fiat et teratur* of *Servius Auctus* with the genuine words of Cato *cum ea terseris, splendidior fiet*: *De agri cult.* 98:

*ligneam supellectilem omnem si unguet, non putescet, et, cum ea terseris, splendidior fiet; item aenea omnia unguito, sed prius extergeto bene. postea, cum unxeris, cum uti voles, extergeto: splendidior erit et aerugo non erit molesta.*

<sup>90</sup> See Lachmann ad *Lucr.* *R.N.* 1.313; *detrimenta* 'material reduction' certainly implies that Isidore knew *De rerum natura* 1.311-319 first hand.

<sup>91</sup> E. Gressel, 'De Isidori Originibus fontibus', *RFIC*, 3, 1875, 258, admitted that Isidore and *Servius Auctus* had shared a common source.

<sup>92</sup> Della Corte (see n. 12), 90.

<sup>93</sup> *Ad filium* fr. 14, quoted by Seneca the Elder, *Contr.1 praef.*, 9, *Quint. Inst.* 12.1.1, *Fortunatianus Art. rhet.* 1.1 81.5 Helm. On the definition of orator see M. Jehne, 'Cato und Bewahrung der traditionellen res publica' in G. Vogt-Spira, B. Rommel, Edd., *Rezeption und Identität: die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma*, Stuttgart, 1999, 125.

There is good reason to surmise that the dictum of fr. 6 was fabricated by an unknown grammarian who borrowed the wording from two of Cato's passages: the definition of orator and the advice about rubbing vessels in the *De agri cultura* 98.<sup>94</sup>

It cannot be determined with certainty why a forger took the title *in oratione*, but the reference-formula of fr. 6 speaks against its authenticity.

When we read something like: Gell.10.13.2: *M. Cato in oratione de re Floria ita scripsit...*,<sup>95</sup> we infer an embedded title, and presume that an explicit title would be *Oratio de re Floria*. However, Gellius 9.12.7 quotes the same speech with the reference-formula *apud M. Catonem de re Floria ita scriptum*.<sup>96</sup> In the whole corpus of the fragments of Cato's speeches the word ORATIO never appears in explicit titles, the only exception being, again, *Servius Auctus* on *Ecl.*6.76: *Cato in oratione de Achais*.<sup>97</sup> But this title was evidently extracted by *Servius Auctus* from the absorbed formula used by Gellius.<sup>98</sup>

## 2.5. Conclusions.

Three quotations in the works of Roman grammarians, fr. 3, 4(a), 4(b) contain the reference-formula (*Epistula*) *ad filium* matching the most common pattern for referring to letters. Compare:

Nonius 275.18 M 422 L: *M. Tullius ad filium*; Diomedes 376.1 K *Calvus alibi ad uxorem*; Charisius 139.3 B 1.108.26 K: *Cicero ad Marcellum*; Diomedes 1.375.27 K: *Cicero ad filium*; etc.

I have suggested that the medical fragments of the *Ad filium* are to be traced back to Cato's letter, and it would be attractive to assume that a collection of Cato's letters may have been an ultimate source for these quotations. Unfortunately the evidence for the collection of Cato's epistles is slight and obscure. In fact, there is only one quotation in which *liber* (as we may conjecture) *epistularum* is referred to.<sup>99</sup>

The letter *Ad filium* about medicine is likely to have been closely connected with the letters about military service. All three letters are attested to have been written by Cato to his elder son Licinianus during the Macedonian campaign of L. Aemilius Paullus, and to which the following fragments belong:

<sup>94</sup> If the commentary on *Georg.* 1.46 actually depends on Isidore, then a forger should not be identified as a compiler of the commentary of *Servius Auctus* on this line. In the Early Middle Ages Cato's *De agri cultura* was forgotten (A. Mazzarino, *M. Porcii Catonis De agri cultura*, Leipzig, 1982, XXIX), a fact which prevents me from recognizing fr. 6 as a medieval forgery (we must also acknowledge that the manuscript source for *Servius Auctus* on *Georg.* 1.46 is the Codex Leidensis Voss. 80 (olim Lemovicensis) dated to 9/10 cent.). I think it unlikely that a forger tried to manipulate a corrupt quotation from the *Ad filium*. Cf. Jahn (see n.1), 265, on *Plin.NH* 18.11.

<sup>95</sup> Cato *Orat.* fr. 213 Malcovati 57.2 Jordan.

<sup>96</sup> Cato *Orat.* fr. 212 Malcovati 57.1 Jordan.

<sup>97</sup> Cato *Orat.* fr. 187 Malcovati, 35 Jordan.

<sup>98</sup> Gell. 2.6.7: *M. Catonis verba sunt ex oratione, quam de Achais scripsit*, the same reference-formula is used by *Macrob. Sat.* 6.7.10.

<sup>99</sup> *Cato ... dixit in epistularum*: Fest. 280.23 L.= Cato, *Epist.* fr. 1 Jordan. Two other fragments are corrupt: Fest. 140.36 L = *Epist.* fr. 2, and Diomedes 1.366.11 K = *Epist.* fr. 5.

- (1) *Epistula de re medica, Ad filium* fr. 1-5;
- (2) *Epistula de iure militari: Epistulae* fr. 4;
- (3) *Epistula, in qua filius laudatur: Epistulae* fr. 3.

There is no evidence that these letters were ever gathered together in one edition to make a book of *Epistulae ad filium*. Cicero reported only one letter about the military service, and, on the contrary, Pliny quoted only the letter about medicine. Plutarch knew two letters about Licinianus' military service, and he was well-informed about the letter on medicine. But later on all traces of the letters about the military service vanished. It seems that no special edition of these letters ever existed. We do not know in what form Cato's three letters became available to Cicero and Pliny, but Plutarch is likely to have borrowed from the *Dubius sermo* at least the quotations about medicine.

Apart from the letter on medicine, there are two other titles with the formula *ad filium*: the *Praecepta* (fr. 7) and the *Libri de agri cultura* (fr. 9). At this point I must stress that the existence of a text is not to be inferred from a title attested in one or two quotations. Grammarians acquired their examples through a long, multi-stage and complicated process of transfer. The titles of *Praecepta ad filium* and the *Libri de agri cultura ad filium* look like philological artifacts created in grammatical classrooms.

Moscow Lomonosov University, Gorky Inst. Of World Literature IMLI, Russian  
Acad. of Science