breadth of possibilities here listed should show that there is something humorous for everyone in the crowd, whatever kind of joke an audience member might wish to find in this scene. This flexibility and breadth of humour is a tribute to Plautus' comic genius, and the mark of a very fine playwright indeed.

*Davidson College and Harvard University* JARRETT T. WELSH
welsh@fas.harvard.edu
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi025

## CICERO, *DE IMPERIO CN. POMPEI* 21*

Cicero is praising the achievements of L. Lucullus in the Third Mithridatic War. Mithridates had come to an agreement with Sertorius, and was planning a naval attack on Italy; but Lucullus defeated him and destroyed his fleet (*De Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 21):

[Dico. . .] ab eodem imperatore classem magnam et ornatam quae ducibus Sertorianis ad Italiam studio atque odio inflammata raperetur superatam esse atque depressam.

atque odio *H*: *om. cett.*

A fleet that is *inflammata* is not likely to get very far—let alone from Pontus to Italy: it is scarcely conceivable that Cicero could be so blind to the literal meaning of his metaphor. He wishes to give the impression of a fleet that would have presented a serious danger to Italy if Lucullus had not intercepted it. *inflammata* works against this impression, suggesting instead a fleet that was likely to burn up without any intervention on Lucullus' part.

If we accept that the word is damaging to the sense, then the necessary correction is surely *inflata. inflata* is in fact the word Cicero uses in the parallel passage at *Mur.* 33, where he is describing a further naval victory in the same campaign:

Quid? illam pugnam navalem ad Tenedum, cum contento cursu acerrimis ducibus hostium classis Italiam spe atque animis inflata peteret, mediocri certamine et parva dimicatione commissam arbitraris?

For a scribe to copy *inflata* as *inflammata* would be a natural enough mistake, particularly if the word was preceded by *odio* (cf. *Mil.* 78: *odio mearum inimicitiarum inflammatus*; *Phil.* 8.21: *inflammati odio*). Indeed, only a few pages further on, at §45, most manuscripts of our speech give *inflammatum* in error for *inflatum*:

Huius adventus et Mithridatem insolita inflatum victoria continuit. . .

inflatum $H\pi$: inflammatum *cett*.

For *inflatus* used with words denoting emotions (*studio atque odio*), compare, in addition to *spe atque animis inflata* at *Mur.* 33 (and *inflatum. . .spe militum* at *Mur.* 49), *inflati laetitia atque insolentia* at *Phil.* 14.15. In our passage, *studio* means much the same as *animis* at *Mur.* 33, and so there would be no difficulty with *studio inflata. odio inflata* might be thought more difficult; but then there is an element of doubt as to whether the words *atque odio* belong in the text at all. On

* This note arises out of research supported by a Research Leave Award granted by the Arts and Humanities Research Board. I should like to express my thanks to the Board.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

balance I should prefer to keep them, since doublets are a characteristic feature of Cicero in this speech, and we have the doublet *spe atque animis* in the parallel passage. The only real objection to *odio inflata* would be that *odio inflammata* is directly paralleled, whereas *odio inflata* is not; but *odio inflata* is not objectionable in itself. As for *inflatus* used in a nautical context (again in addition to *Mur.* 33), it is surely no accident that the word is used in a sentence replete with nautical imagery at *Sest.* 18, *alter. . .puteali et faeneratorum gregibus inflatus, a quibus compulsus olim, ne in Scyllaeo illo aeris alieni tamquam in fretu ad columnam adhaeresceret, in tribunatus portum perfugerat*.

In our passage, then, *studio atque odio inflata* would replace an image that works counter to the intended sense with a striking and appropriate one—an image not just of regal *superbia* (as at § 45), but of full sails and winds of fanatical hatred blowing in the direction of Italy.

*University of Leeds* D. H. BERRY
d.h.berry@leeds.ac.uk
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi026

## NO MORE SLAVE-GANGS: VARRO, *DE RE RUSTICA* 1.2.20–1*

In republican Italy 'all agriculture (was) carried out by men—slaves, freemen, or both'—so Varro tells us in the first book of his *De re rustica*, and this is the general view held today by modern scholars.[1] It is now also generally accepted that there was a range of combinations of labour arrangements, as indeed Varro himself goes on to say (*Rustica* 1.17.3). Similarly, there would have been a range of ways in which slave labour itself was organized, one of which is usually seen in the employment of slave (chain) gangs.[2]

It is not my aim here to debate issues of slave farm management in any detail. Instead, I would like to have a closer look at one specific passage in Varro's agricultural manual, *De re rustica* 1.2.20–1, which has usually been understood as referring to slaves working in (chain) gangs on the rural estates of aristocratic Romans. In short, I wish to question the widely accepted translation, and instead suggest an interpretation that seems to me to be much easier and more natural in the context of the paragraph in which it appears:

> Nec ullae, inquam, pecudes agri culturae sunt propriae, nisi quae agrum opere, quo cultior sit, adiuvare, ut eae quae iunctae arare possunt. (*Rust.* 1.2.20)

> Agrasius, Si istuc ita est, inquit, quo modo pecus removeri potest ab agro, cum stercus, quod plurimum prodest, greges pecorum ministrent? Sic, inquit Agrius, *venalium greges* dicemus agri culturam esse, si propter istam rem habendum statuerimus. Sed error hinc, quod pecus in agro esse potest et fructus in eo agro ferre, quod non sequendum. Nam sic etiam res aliae diversae ab agro erunt adsumendae, ut si habet plures in fundo textores atque institutos

* I wish to thank Michael Crawford, Lynn Fotheringham, James Roy, and the anonymous reader of *CQ* for their very helpful comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this article. Any remaining errors, however, are entirely my own.

[1] Varro, *Rust.* 1.17.2 (text and translation, here and later, are taken from the Loeb Classical Library unless otherwise stated). The most succinct modern overview on the types of farm labourers employed is still K. D. White, *Roman Farming* (London, 1970), ch. 11, esp. 355–6.

[2] This is usually seen in Columella, *Rust.* 1.3.12, 1.6.3, 1.8.16, 1.9.4, 1.9.7–8, 11.1.14–15; Plin. *Ep.* 3.19.7; see also Cato, *Agr.* 56 and 57, and White (n. 1), 361–2.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi026 Published online by Cambridge University Press