physical decrepitude and constitutional strength (reasons why a bodyguard is less of a requirement). Again, Caesar had seemed to have no heir at all at the time of his death and therefore appeared to be inviting trouble (the eighteen-year-old Octavian was adopted posthumously in a will which had been drawn up only six months before);[14] but Augustus had ceremoniously adopted the forty-four-year-old Tiberius a full ten years previously in A.D. 4 and as a precautionary measure had obliged him in his turn to adopt the young Germanicus at the same time (*prouisis etiam heredum in rem publicam opibus*, which means 'having provided for the state resources *consisting of* his heirs').[15]

In these two statements, Augustus' need for a bodyguard before his death is minimized by the bystanders so that in the climax of their speech they can emphasize the absurdity of his requiring protection after his death;[16] and, since in that climax they initially continue to refer to Augustus as still alive (as we have seen), their introduction of this absurdity, which depends upon a final implicit contrast with Caesar, is delayed as late as possible in the interests of cynicism and suspense. Thus: Caesar's lack of a bodyguard ensured that he enjoyed no more than a mere five months of the *quies* which a *princeps* was entitled to expect;[17] but the presence of Augustus' bodyguard was intended to ensure *quies* for his . . . burial (*ut sepultura eius quieta foret*).

University of Durham A. J. WOODMAN

[14] Suet. *DJ* 83.1–2.

[15] In other words, *heredum* is not a possessive genitive, as it is invariably taken (e.g. '. . . had provided his heirs with abundant means to coerce the state' [Church and Brodribb], '. . . not even his heirs should lack for means to coerce their country' [J. Jackson, Loeb]), but a defining genitive: the construction has Sallustian precedent (*Hist.* 4.69.16 *scio . . . tibi magnas opes uirorum . . . esse*). I am not the first to suggest this interpretation: see L. Du Toit, 'A note on Tacitus, *Annals* 1.8.6', *Acta Classica* 21 (1978) 156–7.

Since the announcement of Octavian's adoption seems to have come as a surprise even to the young man himself, it is tempting to ask whether Tacitus' *prouisis* means, not 'provided <by Augustus>', but 'long foreseen <by everyone>' (for the expression, cf. *Ann.* 14.59.1 *nullam opem prouidebat*), thereby emphasizing the contrast still further.

[16] The bystanders' articulation resembles that of an *exemplum ex minoribus ad maius ductum* (for which cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, Eng. trans. [Leiden, 1998], 199, §420).

[17] Cf. Vell. 56.3 of Caesar: *neque illi tanto uiro . . . plus quinque mensium principalis quies contigit.*

A QUOTATION FROM LATIN IN PLUTARCH?

Compared with his immense reading in Greek literature, quotations of Latin authors in Plutarch are few and far between.[1] Although he referred to Latin historical sources when required,[2] recently it has been shown in one case at least that, no doubt due to linguistic difficulties, he tended to minimize his reading of Latin literature to the

[1] See W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O'Neil, *Plutarch's Quotations*, *Philol. Monogr*. 19, *APA* (1959) and add C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), 83, n. 12.

[2] For Plutarch's Latin see e.g. H. J. Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch* (Oxford, 1924 = New York, 1975), 11–19; K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart, 1964[2]), 289–90; A. Zadorojnyi, 'The Roman poets in Plutarch's stories', in C. Schrader, V. Ramón, and J. Vela (edd.), *Plutarco y la historia (Actas del V Simposio Español sobre Plutarco, Zaragoza 20–22 de Junio de 1966*) (1977), 497–506.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.632 Published online by Cambridge University Press

absolutely necessary.[3] Thus every quotation of a Latin text that can be detected in our author and any reflection of a Latin phrase in his writings is of some interest. The following note attempts to trace such a reflection.

At *Cato minor* 11 Plutarch tells us the story of the death of Cato's half-brother Caepio and of Cato's reaction to it:

> In bearing his affliction Cato was thought to have shown more passion than philosophy, considering not only his lamentations, his embracings of the dead, and the heaviness of his grief, but also his expenditure upon the burial, and the pains that he took to have incense and costly raiment burned with the body, and a monument of polished Thasian marble costing eight talents constructed in the market-place of Aenus. For some people cavilled at these things as inconsistent with Cato's usual freedom from ostentation, not observing how much tenderness and affliction was mingled with the man's inflexibility and firmness against pleasures, fears, and shameless entreaties. For the funeral rites, moreover, both cities and dynasts sent him many things for the honour of the dead, from none of whom would he accept money; he did, however, take incense and ornaments, and paid the value of them to the senders. Furthermore, when the inheritance fell to him and Caepio's young daughter, nothing that he expended for the funeral was asked back by him in the distribution of the property. And although such was his conduct then and afterwards, there was one who wrote that he passed the ashes of the dead through a sieve, in search of the gold that had been melted down. So confidently did the writer attribute, not only to his sword, but also to his pen, freedom from accountability and punishment (*οὗτος οὐ τῷ ξίφει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ γραφείῳ τὸ ἀνυπεύθυνον καὶ ἀνυπόδικον ἐπίστευσεν*).
>
> (B. Perrin, LCL translation)

It has been shown[4] that the unveiled reference to Caesar's *Anticato*[5] is part of the polemics of Cato's trusted friend Munatius Rufus, whose eyewitness account formed the basis of his memoirs. There is, however, one detail that has not caught the attention of the commentators.

The juxtaposition of pen and sword seems so natural, especially to English-language readers,[6] that no questions are raised as to its origins. Although indeed it is not feasible to show whether modern languages and literatures have appropriated a classical turn of phrase, it appears that such a turn of phrase is in fact attested. Whereas I could not find a Greek parallel to our idiom, there exist a number of occurrences of the expression in Latin. It appears in two speeches of Cicero,[7] a satire

[3] J. Geiger, 'Plutarch on late Republican orators and rhetoric', in L. van der Stockt (ed.), *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch, Collection d'Études Classiques 11, Acta IVth Int. Congr. Int. Plut. Soc., Leuven, July 3–6, 1996* (Louvain/Namur, 2000), 211–23.

[4] J. Geiger, 'Munatius Rufus and Thrasea Paetus on Cato the Younger', *Athenaeum* 57 (1979), 49–50, 54.

[5] H. J. Tschiedel, *Caesars 'Anticato'. Eine Untersuchung der Testimonien und Fragmente* (Darmstadt, 1981), 113–19 discusses our passage and suggests that Plutarch may have taken the expression here under consideration from his source, but he does not raise the question of the language of that source.

[6] See E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern und München, 1973[8]), 187–8 for a discussion of earlier attestations, and in general *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* (Oxford, 1985[3]), 116.22, 107.4, 233.15, 308.23, and, for additional instances, J. Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations* (Boston and Toronto, 1957[13]), 815a, 106b. In particular, Bulwer-Lytton's 'The pen is mightier than the sword' seems to have made the phrase commonplace. It appears now, apart from everyday use in both literary and journalistic language, in a great number of internet sites and as the title of a journal. One nice example of an English classical scholar taking the phrase as patently obvious even in a Latin context is the note of J. D. Denniston, *Cicero. Philippics I & II. Edited with Introduction & Notes* (Oxford, 1926), on the quotation of *cedant arma togae* at 2.20: 'Perhaps the next line made the sense clearer, or perhaps the alternative reading "linguae" is right: "let the sword yield to the pen".'

[7] Cic. *Mur.* 30: *cedat . . . otium militiae, stilus gladio*, and *Clu.* 123: *censorium stilum . . . dictatorium gladium*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.632 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Horace,[8] and in a couple of passages of Tertullian,[9] and this in all probability does not exhaust the entire Latin literature. Remarkably the three authors employ three different words for sword: *gladius*, *ensis*, and *machaera*. At once one wishes to explain this by different renderings of a Greek expression. Since this seems not to be possible[10] the ultimate origin of the phrase will have to remain uncertain and it will be best to assume that Plutarch renders *verbatim* a Latin expression employed by Munatius Rufus[11] in his polemic against Caesar.[12]

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem JOSEPH GEIGER
geiger@h2.hum.huji.ac.il

[8] Hor. *Sat*. 2.1.39–41: *sed hic stilus haud petet ultro / quemquam animantem et me veluti custodiet ensis / vagina tectus*.

[9] Tert. *Praescr. Her*. 38.9: *Marcion . . . machaera, non stilo usus est . . .*; *Gnost. Scorp*. 13: *Paulus . . . gladium stilo mutans et convertens machaeram in aratrum . . .* In this last passage Tertullian mixes the classical phrase with a famous biblical one, Isa. 2:4, Joel 3:10. No explanation is provided for the title of E. Gellner, *Plough Sword and Book* (Chicago 1989); it seems to mix the biblical phrase with the expression mentioned in n. 12.

[10] It is the ultimate goal of the present note to be proven wrong on this point by readers.

[11] Munatius Rufus is not expressly attested as writing in Latin, but it can be deduced from comparing Val. Max. 4.3.2 and 6.1.14: see Geiger (n. 4), 51.

[12] In a note in Hebrew ('The sword and the book: à propos a poem by Yair', *Tarbiz* 49 [2000], 243–6) I raised the possibility of the derivation of the often repeated Talmudic phrase 'the sword and the book' from classical sources (the change of pen to book being due to euphonic considerations, namely the alliteration of 'sword' and 'book' in Aramaic) and discussed the appearance of both phrases in a poem by a modern Hebrew poet and revolutionary.

SYMPHOSIUS 80: A BELL OF BRASS[1]

Tintinnabulum
Aere rigens curvo patulum conponor in orbem.
Mobilis est intus linguae crepitantis imago.
Non resono positus, †motus quoque† saepe resulto.

Contained in the *Latin Anthology* is a collection of riddles which, according to their preface, were composed at the Roman Saturnalia. Little is known about the author, Symphosius, if indeed that was his name, and his dates (late fourth or early fifth century?) have also been contested. The riddles, each comprising three hexameters and preceded by a lemma which supplies the answer, are concerned with a wide range of subjects. Although not well known today, the collection has in the past been profoundly influential.[2]

The text of the riddle printed above, about a bell, is that of Shackleton Bailey,[3] who records in his apparatus a number of attempts to make sense of the crux in the third line: *motus longeque* Castalio (printed by Baehrens), *sed motus saepe* Schenkl (printed by Riese), and his own tentative suggestion *commotus saepe*.[4]

[1] I am very grateful to the anonymous referee who commented on an earlier version of this note.

[2] On Symphosius generally, see the bibliographies and discussion given by K. Smolak in Reinhart Herzog and Peter Lebrecht Schmidt (edd.), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* 5 (Munich, 1989), 249–52.

[3] D. R Shackleton Bailey, *Anthologia Latina* I.1 (Teubner, 1982), 281.255–7.

[4] See D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 'Towards a text of "Anthologia Latina" ', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, suppl. vol. 5 (1979), 39–40.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.632 Published online by Cambridge University Press