5. CONCLUSION

Varro's teacher Aelius Stilo did not avoid *nouissimus* on the grounds that we need an analytic superlative, or because *nouus* should not have a superlative at all. He shunned the word because of its meaning 'last', a meaning which is not fully predictable from the base form *nouus* 'new'. Our passage should thus be translated as follows:

> From this also *extremum* 'last' popularly began to be called *nouissimum* 'newest', which in my time both Aelius and some older men avoided on the grounds that it was an overly new word. Its origin is this: just as from *uetus* 'old' we get *uetustius* 'older' and *ueterrimum* 'oldest', so from *nouum* 'new' was derived *nouius* 'newer' and *nouissimum* 'newest', which is *extremum* 'last'.

If we want to be less literal but closer to what Varro intended, we could translate as 'on the grounds that it was an overly unusual meaning of the word'.

Wolfson College, Oxford WOLFGANG D.C. DE MELO
wolfgang.demelo@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838819000788

TWO TEXTUAL NOTES ON CICERO, *DE OFFICIIS*

(1) 1.21:

> ex quo, quia suum cuiusque fit eorum quae natura fuerant communia quod cuique obtigit, id quisque teneat; †e quo si quis† sibi appetet, uiolabit ius humanae societatis.

The base text cited is that of Winterbottom.[1] After discussing the origin of private property, Cicero asserts that it should be maintained as distributed (*id quisque teneat*). Of the matter marked corrupt, *e quo* (sometimes written *ex quo* or with a letter deleted after *e*; see Winterbottom's apparatus criticus) is likely to be a repetition of the preceding *ex quo* and therefore intrusive (as Winterbottom suggested ad loc.: 'fort. delendum'). *si quis* evidently requires supplementation. Müller (after marginal corrections in printings of Lambinus's edition) inserted *quid* after *quis*,[2] but in that case one would expect a further specification (*quid alienum* or the like). The better candidate for the supplement after *quis* is perhaps *plus*, the reading of the two fifteenth-century Munich codices 7020 and 650 (M and S respectively), an easy error.[3] Cf. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 3.13: *cum plus appetat quam ipse Sulla …*; *Sull.* 84: *ut ego mihi plus appetere coner quam quantum omnes inimici inuidique patiantur.*

[1] M. Winterbottom, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De officiis* (Oxford, 1994).
[2] C.F.W. Müller, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De officiis libri tres für den Schulgebrauch erklärt* (Leipzig, 1882), ad loc.
[3] The presence of the reading in these two witnesses suggests that it may have been the reading of L (London, Harley 2716) and thus be Carolingian; cf. Winterbottom (n. 1), viii–ix.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000855 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2) 1.49:

multi enim faciunt multa temeritate quadam sine iudicio †uel morbo in omnes uel† repentino quodam quasi uento impetu animi incitati; …

This is a *locus conclamatus*, for which no satisfactory solution has been found.[4] The first *uel* should surely be emended to *uelut* so as to show that *morbus* is being used metaphorically;[5] the two possibilities could have induced readers to think of a *uel* ... *uel* construction, even though the two parts are not truly parallel.

Holford-Strevens *apud* Winterbottom proposed supplying *prodigi* after *omnes*, but there appears to be no parallel for construing *prodigus* with *in* + accusative,[6] and it would be hard to explain the corruption. Perhaps rather *in omnes* <*liberales*>, the thought thus rounded off with a ditrochaic clausula. *liberalis* is not negative *per se*. *liberalitas* is, however, the main topic of this section (1.42: *de beneficentia ac de liberalitate dicatur*), with repeated discussion of who does or does not qualify as *liberalis*. That the quality is carried too far is implied by *in omnes* and made explicit by *uelut morbo*. For *liberalis* with *in* + accusative, see *Planc.* 63: *Cyrenis liberalem in publicanos, iustum in suos fuisse*; Sen. *Ep.* 20.3: *obserua te ... numquid in te liberalis sis, in tuos sordidus*.[7] The error is easily explained by saltation from *-es* to *-es*.[8]

Los Angeles ANDREW R. DYCK
doi:10.1017/S0009838819000855

NVMEROSVS HORATIVS?

One of the most famous inscriptions to have survived from ancient Rome is the *acta* of the Ludi Saeculares of 17 B.C. (*CIL* 6.32323 = *ILS* 5050),[1] and one of the most evocative of all epigraphic sentences occupies a line to itself (149): *Carmen composuit Q. Horatius Flaccus*. This reference to the author of the *Carmen Saeculare*, says Fraenkel, 'was the result of a carefully considered decision of the highest authorities'.[2] The degree of careful consideration is initially evident from the prominent positioning of the poet's name directly above those of Augustus and Agrippa in the following line.[3] It

[4] For discussion, see A.R. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero*, De officiis (Ann Arbor, 1996), 164–5.
[5] So already M. Pohlenz, *Antikes Führertum: Cicero De officiis und das Lebensideal des Panaitios* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1934), 36 n. 3.
[6] See *TLL* 10.2.1612.10–19. The usage of Sil. *Pun.* 15.495–6 (*belloque parata | prodigere in bellum*) is dubiously relevant to Cicero.
[7] See further *TLL* 7.2.1291.11–45; *OLD* s.v. *liberalis* 4.
[8] I would like to thank this journal's reader for helpful suggestions.

For comment I am grateful to I.M.Le M. Du Quesnay and J. Nelis-Clément.
[1] The standard edition is B. Schnegg-Köhler, *Die augusteischen Säkularspiele* (Munich and Leipzig, 2002); on the Games, see e.g. D. Feeney, *Literature and Religion at Rome* (Cambridge, 1998), 28–31.
[2] E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 406.
[3] See J. Nelis-Clément and D. Nelis, '*Furor epigraphicus*: Augustus, the poets, and the inscriptions', in P. Liddel and P. Low (edd.), *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford, 2013), 317–47, at 322–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000855 Published online by Cambridge University Press