unsatisfactory and rather bland *difficilest* of the manuscript tradition. Lambinus' *desiperest* entirely befits the indignant and ironic tone of Lucretius' arguments at this point.

Trinity College, Oxford ABIGAIL BUGLASS
abigail.buglass@trinity.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838813000852

CICERO, *PRO MURENA* 47 AND 85

47 illa quidem quae mea summa voluntate senatus frequens repudiavit mediocriter adversata tibi esse existimas? confusionem suffragiorum flagitasti, †praerogationum legis Maniliae†, aequationem gratiae, dignitatis, suffragiorum. graviter homines honesti atque in suis vicinitatibus et municipiis gratiosi tulerunt a tali viro esse pugnatum ut omnes et dignitatis et gratiae gradus tollerentur.

Cicero is narrating various proposals advanced by Servius Sulpicius Rufus in an attempt to save his failing consular campaign of 63. In addition to the *lex Tullia de ambitu* discussed in the preceding section,[1] he mentions this proposal that was blocked in the senate. The text printed is that of Clark, who compares [Sall.] 2.8.1, citing a law promulgated by C. Gracchus in his tribunate: *ut ex confusis quinque classibus sorte centuriae vocarentur*. On this basis Clark suspected that the transmitted *praerogationum* conceals a reference to the *praerogativa* (*centuria*), the first to vote in the *comitia centuriata*, traditionally chosen by lot from the centuries of the first class and the twelve classes of *equites*, and thus highly influential.[2] Certainly this is more plausible than Mommsen's *perrogationem* ('the successive asking for opinions': *OLD* s.v. *perrogatio*), which is not attested in any classical author.

Clark also thought that the reference to the Manilian law was interpolated by a scholiast, but this is difficult to credit. Ryan is probably right to see here a reference to the *lex Manilia de libertinorum suffragiis*, which allowed freedmen to vote in all the tribes, a proposal that had once been made by P. Sulpicius Rufus (*tr. pl.* 88), possibly a brother or cousin of Servius Sulpicius' father (Asc. 64C).[3] Ryan's own conjecture, *promulgationem* for *praerogationum*, is, however, unlikely to be right: Clark's *praerogativa* (or some form thereof) is a much more plausible source of the transmitted text; and the *promulgatio* of something designated as a *lex*, rather than a *rogatio*, would seem to call for explanation. The corruption may be deeper than previously assumed.

I propose that the critical sentence should read (supplements in angular brackets):

confusionem suffragiorum flagitasti, praerogati < vae ex quinque classibus sortitionem, renovati > onem legis Maniliae, aequationem gratiae, dignitatis, suffragiorum.

[1] R. Feig Vishnia, *Roman Elections in the Age of Cicero: Society, Government, and Voting* (New York and London, 2012), 136, places the law within the history of such legislation; it provided, however, no definitive solution; cf. A.M. Riggsby, *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome* (Austin, 1999), 152. Cicero complains of violations of his law at *Sest.* 133 and *Vat.* 37.

[2] Cf. E.S. Staveley, *Greek and Roman Voting and Elections* (London, 1972), 154–5; C. Meyer, *RE* Suppl. 8, 567.44 (s.v. *Praerogativa centuria*).

[3] F.X. Ryan, 'Cicero, *Mur.* 47: text and meaning', *Gymnasium* 101 (1994), 481–2. For the short-lived Manilian law (invalidated by the senate the day after its enactment), cf. G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (Milan, 1912), 375. For the possible relation of Servius to the tribune of 88, cf. Münzer, *RE* 4A1, 851.62–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000864 Published online by Cambridge University Press

You demanded a jumbling of the votes, a selection of the *praerogativa* by lot from the five classes, a reprise of the Manilian law, a levelling of influence, standing, votes.

This text would attribute a coherent programme to Sulpicius, who apparently thought a basic change in voting mechanisms, reducing the influence of the first century called upon to vote and distributing the freedmen more widely, would make bribery less effective (since more money would be needed to influence the result). Cicero will be referring (non-technically) to Servius' proposed use of the *lex Manilia* as a *renovatio*, which may be his tendentious interpretation of the proposal rather than the terms in which Sulpicius promoted it.[4] If that is right, then a saltation error will have led the scribe's eye from *praerogati-* to *renovati-*. If one assumes the normal abbreviations, the supplement amounts to thirty-three characters, a normal line-length for a text written in two columns per side, so that the error might have been facilitated by *praerogati-* and *renovati-* having stood one above the other.

85 unus erit consul, et is non in administrando bello sed in sufficiendo conlega occupatus. hunc iam qui impedituri sint * * * illa pestis immanis importuna Catilinae prorumpet, qua po * * * minatur; in agros suburbanos advolabit; versabitur in urbe furor, in curia timor, in foro coniuratio, in campo exercitus, in agris vastitas; omni autem in sede ac loco ferrum flammamque metuemus.

Cicero is describing the situation that will obtain if Murena is convicted and on 1 January Rome has only one consul in office. Again, the text is that of Clark, the lacunae marked in the codices. I suggest that the following restoration of the critical portion may be along the right lines:

hunc iam qui impedituri sint <stant parati; hoc impedito> illa pestis immanis importuna Catilinae prorumpet, qua po<test maxima vi et manu> minabitur etc.

Those meaning to hinder him already stand prepared; when he is hindered, Catiline, that monstrous plague, will break out, will threaten with the utmost violence and power he can muster …

The first lacuna is marked by about two lines that are left free in the major witnesses. This fact suggests a mechanical loss of matter (rather than e.g. mere saltation), though it is not necessarily a reliable indicator of the extent of the loss. More matter may have been lost than the foregoing restorations indicate: they are of *c*. twenty characters each and so would not fill out an average line in bi-columnar format (see above). The ablative absolute with anaphora of the deictic pronoun and the change of *impedio* from future to past would highlight the rapidly advancing threat. For the *iunctura* cf. *Leg. agr.* 2.99: *nihil vi et manu perfringi posset.* The change of *minatur* to *minabitur* seems to be required by the series of futures.[5]

Los Angeles ANDREW R. DYCK

doi:10.1017/S0009838813000864

[4] The noun *renovatio* is used by Cicero in a variety of contexts, though not with reference to legislation (*r. doctrinae*: *Brut.* 250, *r. timoris*: *Fam.* 11.18.3, *r. mundi*: *Nat. D.* 2.118, etc.). That *renovare* can be used with reference to public institutions is clear e.g. from *Balb.* 34: *tum est cum Gaditanis foedus vel renovatum vel ictum*; Liv. 3.55.6: … *ipsis quoque tribunis, ut sacrosancti viderentur, cuius rei prope iam memoria aboleverat, relatis quibusdam ex magno intervallo caerimoniis renovarunt* …

[5] I would like to thank the journal's readers for helpful advice and the Editor for his patience.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000864 Published online by Cambridge University Press