The Classical Quarterly 69.2 793–800 © The Classical Association (2020)
doi:10.1017/S0009838819000983

DID CICERO 'PROSCRIBE' MARCUS ANTONIUS?*

Pliny's celebration of Cicero's consular achievements contains a striking anomaly, namely the assertion that Cicero proscribed Marcus Antonius *(HN* 7.117). That statement turns Cicero, the victim of Antonius' murderous vendetta, into the one who wielded the executioner's axe, and it abruptly shifts the focus of the passage from 63 to 43 B.C. Two slight corrections to the Latin text can eliminate the intrusion of the proscriptions by substituting a reference to the control Cicero exercised in 63 over Gaius Antonius, his consular colleague and an old ally of Catiline. In his *In Pisonem* (§5), Cicero takes credit for combatting the threat posed by his colleague, and it is highly probable that *HN* 7.117 mentioned Gaius (not Marcus) Antonius as well, since Pliny's summary of Cicero's consular deeds and honours is nearly identical to the one found in *Pis*. 4–6. The beauty of the emended text is that it restores both historical fact and a logical progression to the overall structure of Pliny's encomium.

At *HN* 7.116, Pliny states that he will celebrate Cicero's outstanding genius by singling out solely the deeds of his consulship:

sed quo te, M. Tulli, piaculo taceam, quoue maxime excellentem insigni praedicem? quo potius quam uniuersi populi illius gentium[a] amplissimi[b] testimonio, **e tota uita tua consulatus tantum operibus electis**?

[a] gentium *Welzhofer* : genti *DE*^{1}*F*^{1}*Rae* : gentis *E*^{2}*F*^{2}*doz* : sciscentis *Detlefsen* : uigentis *Madvig* : *del*. illius gentis *Mayhoff* [b] amplissimi *DEF*^{1}*ae* -mo *rell.*

How am I to justify not mentioning you, Cicero, or how am I to praise you with the distinction you so richly deserve? What better way than by means of the unanimous testimony of the greatest people on earth, **selecting out of your whole life solely the deeds of your consulship**?

In keeping with that announced intention, Pliny goes on in the next sentence (§117) to describe three of Cicero's oratorical triumphs during his consulship:

te dicente legem agrariam, hoc est alimenta sua, abdicarunt tribus; te suadente Roscio theatralis auctori legis ignouerunt notatasque se discrimine sedis aequo animo tulerunt; te orante proscriptorum liberos honores petere puduit;

Thanks to your speech, the voters rejected a proposed agrarian law, that is, their very sustenance. Thanks to your urging, they forgave Roscius, the originator of the theatre law, and bore equitably their degradation as a result of a difference in seating. Thanks to your pleading, the children of the proscribed felt ashamed to seek public office.

* I thank Bob Kaster, Christopher Pelling, Kathryn Welch and Michael Winterbottom for reading and commenting on earlier drafts. I thank John Briscoe for help with textual matters and Gesine Manuwald for an insightful discussion of the topic covered in n. 13. All English translations are my own.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000983 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The speeches delivered on those three occasions are listed in the same order in Cic. *Att*. 2.1(21).3, a letter written in June 60 that singles out twelve of Cicero's consular speeches that he was forming into a corpus:[1] *De lege agraria* 1–4 (January), which successfully opposed the bill of the tribune P. Servilius Rullus, who proposed the distribution of public land in allotments to discharged veterans and the poor (Cic. *Att*. 2.1[21].3; *Pis*. 4; Plut. *Cic*. 12.2–6); *De Othone* (July),[2] which persuaded an unruly theatre-crowd to cheer instead of heckle L. Roscius Otho (*pr*. 63), whose law of 67 B.C. had set aside for knights the fourteen rows of seats immediately behind the senatorial seats in the orchestra (Cic. *Att*. 2.1[21].3; Plut. *Cic*. 13.2–4); and *De proscriptorum filiis* (August/September),[3] in which Cicero, as the magistrate presiding over the elections, justified his decision to uphold the disqualification from holding public office that Sulla had imposed on the sons and grandsons of his enemies whom he had proscribed in 82–81 (Cic. *Att*. 2.1[21].3; *Pis*. 4; Plut. *Cic*. 12.2; Quint. *Inst*. 11.1.85). Next, while continuing to maintain the chronological sequence observed by the letter, Pliny alludes to Cicero's *First Catilinarian* (November) but then departs radically from his announced intention, as well as from historical reality, by claiming that Cicero proscribed Marcus Antonius:

tuum Catilina fugit ingenium; tu M. Antonium proscripsisti.

Catiline fled from your brilliance; you proscribed Marcus Antonius.

Reference to the proscriptions in 43 takes the reader by surprise and seems wholly out of place, especially since in the very next sentence, Pliny resumes his chronological enumeration of Cicero's achievements as consul in 63. Specifically, he describes two honours conferred on Cicero in December: the title *parens patriae* and a civilian 'triumph'.

salue primus omnium parens patriae appellate, primus in toga triumphum linguaeque lauream merite, et facundiae Latiarumque litterarum parens,[a] atque, ut dictator Caesar hostis quondam tuus de te scripsit, omnium triumphorum laurea maior,[b] quanto plus est ingenii Romani terminos in tantum promouisse quam imperi.

[a] *del.* et facundiae … parens *Ernout* [b] *Sillig* : -ore RF^1d : -rae *D* : -rem *rell.*

Hail, the first of all to be named Father of the Fatherland,[4] the first civilian to merit a triumph and laurel crown for speech, father too of Latin eloquence and literature. Furthermore, as your

[1] R. Rouse and M. Reeve in L.D. Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford, 1983), 55, *citing HN* 7.116–17, speculate that Pliny may have drawn upon that collected edition. W. McDermott, 'Cicero's publication of his consular orations', *Philologus* 116 (1972), 277–84, who argued that the planned corpus was never produced, concluded at 284 n. 25 that the polymath Pliny had only a general knowledge of Cicero's *opera omnia*.

[2] For the correct date, 9 July, not 4 April as commonly assumed, see J.T. Ramsey, 'The date of the consular elections in 63 B.C. and the inception of Catiline's conspiracy', *HSPh* 110 (2018) (forthcoming in 2020).

[3] For the date, see Ramsey (n. 2).

[4] In recognition of his preserving the state from destruction at the hands of the Catilinarians, Cicero was hailed *parens patriae* by the senior consular Q. Catulus (Cic. *Pis*. 6; *Sest*. 121, named *pater patriae* by Catulus and *multi alii*; cf. *Phil*. 2.12; *Att*. 9.10[177].3). Pliny may have understood 'Father of the Fatherland' to be a formal title conferred by a vote of the Senate, as was done later for Julius Caesar and the emperors, and he claims that Cicero was the first to be so honoured, a boast that Cicero himself never makes: see R. Kaster, *Cicero, Speech on behalf of Publius Sestius* (Oxford, 2006), 353–4. The context of Catulus' salutation is commonly said to have been the meeting of the Senate on 3 December 63 (so P. Stein, *Die Senatssitzungen der Ciceronischen Zeit (68–43)* [Münster, 1930], 14 n. 64), but F.X. Ryan, *Rank and Participation in the Republican Senate*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000983 Published online by Cambridge University Press

erstwhile enemy the Dictator Caesar wrote concerning you, 'yours is a laurel crown greater than that of all triumphs[5] by as much as it is a superior accomplishment to have advanced so extensively the frontiers of Roman genius in contrast with mere territory'.[6]

Apart from 'you proscribed Marcus Antonius', every one of the achievements and accolades catalogued by Pliny in §117 belongs to the year 63. Marcus Antonius and the proscriptions are utterly out of place in Pliny's encomium of Cicero's consular achievements.[7] Indeed, the claim that Cicero proscribed Marcus Antonius is so contrary to historical fact that it ended up being corrected to '*Ciceronem proscripsit*' in Ludwig von Ian's index of Pliny, s.v. 'Antonius, M.'[8]

At first blush, it may be tempting to interpret 'you proscribed Marcus Antonius' as a clever paradox, treating *proscribo* as metaphorical, a tribute to Cicero's *Philippics*.[9] Cicero boasted in the *Philippics* (13.40) that he would blacken Antonius' reputation for all time,[10] and one could conceivably argue that the destruction of Antonius' good name amounted to 'proscription'. Cicero's words in the *Thirteenth Philippic* clearly lie behind Velleius Paterculus' statement that Cicero 'branded Antonius' reputation with marks of everlasting infamy' (2.64.3),[11] which makes it possible to speculate that Pliny could have been thinking along the same lines in describing Antonius as 'proscribed' by

(Stuttgart, 1998), 15 n. 23 makes a convincing argument for putting the honour somewhat later in the month, not before 5 December.

[5] The description of Cicero's unique and superior 'laurel crown' recalls the often-quoted line from Cicero's poem on his consulship (*Consulatus suus* fr. 11 Büchner = 16 Morel = 12 Courtney): *cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi* ('let arms yield to the toga, let the laurel crown [of a military victor] take second place to honour [conferred on a statesman]'). The signal honour awarded to Cicero on 3 December 63 was, of course, not a triumph but a Thanksgiving (*supplicatio*), unique in that Cicero was the first and only civilian to receive that recognition (Cic. *Cat*. 3.15 *quod mihi primum post hanc urbem conditam togato contigit*; cf. *Cat*. 4.5; *Phil*. 2.13).

[6] A. Garcea, *Caesar's* De Analogia (Oxford, 2012), 94–7 has recently defended the traditional assignment of Caesar's praise of Cicero to his *Anticato* (so B. Kübler and A. Klotz [edd.] *Caesar, Commentarii et fragmenta*, vol. 3.1 [Leipzig, 1897], 146 and vol. 3 [Leipzig, 1927], 188 respectively). The rival view of G.L. Hendrickson, 'The *De Analogia* of Julius Caesar; its occasion, nature, and date, with additional fragments', *CPh* 1 (1906), 97–120, at 118–19 attributes Caesar's remarks to his *De Analogia* of 54 B.C., a work dedicated to Cicero. In support, Hendrickson adduces a possible allusion to Caesar's praise of Cicero at *Brut.* 255, which predates Caesar's *Anticato* by roughly a year.

[7] Scholars have noted the intrusion without questioning the paradosis. E.g. R.E. Wolverton, 'The encomium of Cicero in Pliny the Elder', in C. Henderson (ed.), *Classical, Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Ullman*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1964), 1.159–64, at 161–2: 'The real curiosity of his list, however, is the entry "you proscribed Mark Antony".'; R. Schilling, *Pline l'Ancien, Histoire naturelle, Livre 7* (Budé: Paris, 1977), 184–5: 'Il déborde toutefois cette époque par l'allusion à la proscription d'Antoine.'; M. Winterbottom, 'Cicero and the Silver Age', in B. Vickers (ed.), *Rhetoric Revalued* (Binghamton, NY, 1982), 237–64, at 238–9 n. 6: 'Pliny, *Nat*. VII 116 thought Cicero's consulship enough to ensure his fame; but he mentions his dealings with Antony too (117).'; A. Darab, 'Cicero bei Plinius den Ältere', *Acta Classica Univ. Scient. Debrecen*. 31 (1995), 33–41, at 39: 'fügte er seiner Liste auch das tapfere Auftreten gegen Antonius hinzu, ohne dabei daran zu denken, daß es chronologische inconsequent ist.'; M. Beagon, *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History, Book 7* (Oxford, 2005), 308: 'P. here deviates from the consular speeches.'

[8] Teubner, vol. 6 (Leipzig, 1865/1898), 37, citing *HN* 7.117, where, according to the paradosis, *Cicero proscripsit Antonium*, and 14.147, where Antonius is referred to as Cicero's *interfector*.

[9] E.g. Beagon (n. 7), 308: 'P. plays on the word *proscribo* … Cicero's condemnation and ultimate outlawing of Antony as a public enemy was [*sic*] immortalized in fourteen published speeches.' Cf. Winterbottom (n. 7).

[10] *quem ego inustum uerissimis maledictorum notis tradam hominum memoriae sempiternae* ('But I shall brand him with the marks of insults of the truest sort that will always be remembered by future generations').

[11] *aeternas Antonii memoriae inussit notas*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000983 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cicero. The trouble is, not only does the jarring departure from Pliny's announced intention to limit himself to the achievements of Cicero's consulship shatter the connection with all that has preceded it, but the very next sentence transports us instantly back to the year 63 with the mention of Cicero's title *parens patriae* and civilian 'triumph' (December 63).

What the passage should ideally describe is some person, other than M. Antonius, and some event, other than the proscriptions, that will contribute to the chronological enumeration of Cicero's consular achievements. Two slight emendations of the text will produce that desired outcome.

tu [M.] Antonium <circum>scripsisti

you curbed Antonius

This solution is both elegantly simple and easy to justify, because it is well known that Cicero had to combat a grave threat to public safety posed by his consular colleague C. Antonius (Hybrida), Marcus Antonius' uncle. C. Antonius and Catiline had formed a pact to run jointly for the consulship in 64 and block Cicero's election.[12] Although from the early days of his consulship Cicero had apparently been able to count upon some measure of cooperation from Antonius by agreeing to exchange Macedonia, the more lucrative of the proconsular provinces, for Cisalpine Gaul,[13] Cicero had to remain vigilant throughout his year in office to keep Antonius from being drawn back into Catiline's orbit. Cicero credits P. Sestius, who served as *quaestor* under Antonius in 63, with keeping a watchful eye on him to forestall any disloyalty (*Sest*. 8). Antonius posed a potential threat because of his willingness to back, or appear to back, Catiline's bid for the consulship in 63 (Cic. *Mur*. 49), and his complicity in Catiline's plot is taken for granted by several later sources (for example Dio Cass. 37.30.3; *Schol. Bob*. 126St on *Sest*. 8). Cicero (*Cael*. 74) goes so far as to claim that a lingering suspicion (*opinio*) of Antonius' involvement in the conspiracy helped contribute to his condemnation for extortion in 59 (cf. *Schol. Bob*. p. 94St on *Flacc*. 5; Dio Cass. 38.10.3). As is well known, on the occasion of the final battle near Pistoia in January 62, Antonius turned over the command of his army to his legate M. Petreius so as to

[12] Asc. 83C. For a splendid analysis of the dynamics of that political alliance, see M. Stone, 'Three men in a hurry: the consular elections of 64 B.C.', *Classicum* 19 (1993), 2–4.

[13] Sall. *Cat*. 26.4. The harmony that Cicero claims he established with his colleague by early January 63 (*Leg. agr*. 2.103, *ex concordia quam mihi constitui cum collega*) indicates that the exchange of provinces is likely to have taken place in late 64, while Cicero and Antonius were still consuls-designate. That timing of the pact between them makes the best sense since, even before the plebeian tribunes of 63 entered office on 10 December 64, Cicero became aware of their intention to sponsor an agrarian bill that he was likely to want to oppose as soon as he entered office on 1 January (*Leg. agr*. 2.11–14). To have embarked upon the opposition without first neutralizing a potential threat from C. Antonius would have been risky (cf. Plut. *Cic*. 12.3–4). D. Rafferty, 'Cisalpine Gaul as a consular province in the Late Republic', *Historia* 66 (2017), 147–72, at 162 n. 94 has challenged this reconstruction of events on the ground that the way in which Cicero describes his future governorship as going out to '*a* province' (*in provinciam*, *Leg. agr*. 1.26), as opposed to a specific province, implies that Macedonia and Cisalpina were not yet assigned as of the date of that speech, 1 January. However, Cicero's failure to name a particular province need not mean that the *sortitio* of provinces, or the exchange with Antonius, had not yet taken place. Rather, Cicero may have spoken in general terms merely to contrast the role of a provincial governor with that of a magistrate in Rome. Or, he may have refrained from naming his proconsular province either because the deal with Antonius was still somewhat provisional or because he was not yet ready to make it public.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000983 Published online by Cambridge University Press

avoid coming face to face with his former political confederate Catiline (Dio Cass. 37.39.4; *Schol. Bob*. 127St on *Sest*. 12; cf. Sall. *Cat*. 59.4; Cic. *Sest*. 12).

In §5 of his *In Pisonem*, Cicero explicitly lists among his consular achievements his success in overcoming the threat posed by the political sympathies of his colleague Antonius. And Cicero does so after covering just above, in §4, two of the three accomplishments singled out by Pliny *in HN* 7.117. He puts first, as Pliny does, his opposition to the agrarian bill. Third, as in Pliny, is his act of blocking the sons of the proscribed from standing for public office. The one notable discrepancy is that, in place of *De Othone*, Cicero reminds his senatorial audience of his defence of Gaius Rabirius (*Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo*). After recounting those three patriotic services to the state, Cicero takes credit for winning Antonius' cooperation by exchanging provinces with him and later giving up the province of Cisalpine Gaul:

ego Antonium conlegam cupidum prouinciae, multa in re publica molientem, patientia atque obsequio meo mitigaui. ego prouinciam Galliam senatus auctoritate exercitu et pecunia instructam et ornatam, quam cum Antonio commutaui, quod ita existimabam tempora rei publicae ferre, in contione deposui reclamante populo Romano.

By means of my patient deference, I tamed my colleague Antonius, who craved a province and was stirring up a great deal of political trouble. Because I regarded it best for the public interest, I gave up in the face of opposition at a public meeting the right to govern Gaul, which I had exchanged with Antonius,[14] a province equipped and furnished with a budget and army by authority of the Senate.

Cicero next summarizes what he accomplished by means of his *First* and *Third Catilinarians*, after which he goes on in *Pis*. 6 to describe the accolade of being named *parens patriae*. That honour, as we have seen, comes immediately after the statement in Pliny that Cicero proscribed M. Antonius. Then, just as Pliny places Cicero's civilian 'triumph' after mentioning the title *parens patriae*, Cicero does likewise in the *In Pisonem*, reminding his audience of the *supplicatio* that was decreed uniquely to him as a civilian. The parallels between *In Pisonem* 4–6 and Plin. *HN* 7.117 are too striking and numerous, both in content and in language, to be ignored. Items not shared are marked with {} in the list below.

In Pisonem 4–6	*Naturalis historia* 7.117
§4 *De lege agraria*	*De lege agraria*
{*Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo*}	{*De Othone*}
De proscriptorum filiis	*De proscriptorum filiis*
§5 'Antonium mitigaui'	
{*Cum prouinciam in contione deposuit*}	
In Catilinam I	*In Catilinam* I
	'[M.] Antonium <circum>scripsisti'
{*In Catilinam* III}	
§6 Title *parens patriae*	Title *parens patriae*
Unique civilian honour: *supplicatio*	Unique civilian honour: *'triumphus'*

[14] Since Cicero obtained Cisalpina by *exchanging* provinces with Antonius (*commutaui*), there must have been a drawing of lots. This rules out the possibility that the consuls decided by mutual agreement which province each was to govern, as was done, for instance, in 109 and 75 (Sall. *Jug*. 43.1, *Hist*. 2.86R.11, respectively). A. Lintott, *Plutarch: Demosthenes and Cicero* (Oxford, 2013), 150 allows for Macedonia and Cisalpina to have been assigned by either method, but clearly Antonius must have opted for *sortitio* in the hope of obtaining Macedonia, if he could, without having to make a deal with Cicero.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000983 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There are, admittedly, a few slight discrepancies between the two lists, but they are easily explained. To begin with, as noted above, Pliny selected as his second example Cicero's *De Othone*, whereas Cicero singled out his *Pro Rabirio*. The choice on Pliny's part is logical, because his aim was to illustrate the persuasiveness of Cicero's oratory, a quality that was undeniably present in the *De Othone* and arguably in the *De lege agraria* and *De proscriptorum filiis* as well, at least as the latter two speeches are portrayed by Pliny. What those three speeches had in common, according to Pliny, was the power to charm the birds out of the trees by influencing people to renounce something that they previously believed to be in their interest (free land, front-row seats in the theatre, and public office).[15] By contrast, Cicero in the *In Pisonem* selected his *Pro Rabirio* as his second example of a consular achievement because he wanted to remind his senatorial audience of how that speech had served to defend the Senate's right to declare martial law by passing the so-called *senatus consultum ultimum*.[16]

A second notable difference is that Pliny places the *First Catilinarian* ahead of mentioning Antonius, whereas in *Pis*. 5 Cicero put his 'taming' of Antonius ahead of his *First Catilinarian*, because he alludes to his dealings with Antonius in the context of relinquishing his province of Cisalpine Gaul (in October).[17] The latter detail and speech (*cum prouinciam in contione deposuit*) found no place in Pliny's survey. Nor did Pliny say anything about Cicero's *Third Catilinarian*, although Cicero touched upon it in the *In Pisonem*. Understandably Pliny refrained from including those two consular speeches because his survey of Cicero's consulship was more telegraphic, and his emphasis was on the persuasiveness of Cicero's oratory. It is also rhetorically effective in Pliny's terse account to have Catiline's name precede Antonius', since that is the order in which they are usually named whenever they are mentioned in the same breath. As will be pointed out below, the presence of *Catilina* in the preceding clause should have ensured that Pliny's readers would have no difficulty in recognizing the identity of Antonius, even without being given his *praenomen*.

On the positive side, it is to be observed that Pliny and Cicero provide a similar characterization of what was achieved by the *First Catilinarian*: it put Catiline to flight (Pliny); in it Cicero *ordered* Catiline to leave Rome (*egredi ex urbe iussi*, *Pis*. 5).[18] As

[15] Ironically, only the *De Othone* is likely to have caused Cicero's audience to change its outlook on the spot (if the account in Plut. *Cic*. 13.4 is to be believed). Pliny exaggerates the persuasive power of the other two speeches. It is doubtful that Rullus' bill failed to become law because the people did not want to be given land (T.N. Michell, *Cicero: The Ascending Years* [New Haven, 1979], 186 n. 19), and apart from the claim by Pliny there is no good evidence that the bill was put to a vote and was rejected by the Assembly (A. Lintott, *Cicero as Evidence* [Oxford, 2008], 142 citing in n. 37 *Rab. perd*. 32 and *Sull*. 65). For the likely fate of the bill, see G. Manuwald, *Cicero, Agrarian Speeches* (Oxford, 2018), xxiv, and ibid., 106 for a fine discussion of how *re<pudiauistis>* at *Rab. perd*. 32 bears upon this question. It is also highly improbable that Cicero's speech justifying his decision not to allow the sons of the proscribed to stand for public office caused them to feel shame (*puduit*). We are told that Cicero himself openly admitted the harshness of the Sullan regulation he was upholding for the sake of the stability of the state (Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.85).

[16] As J. Zetzel, *Cicero, Ten Speeches* (Indianapolis, 2009), 236 n. 22 remarks, the *De Othone*, although included in the list of Cicero's consular orations at *Att*. 2.1(21).3, did not suit Cicero's purposes in the *In Pisonem*.

[17] For the date, see Ramsey (n. 2). The exchange itself, as argued at n. 13 above, was almost certainly made in the latter half of 64.

[18] Cf. the similar way in which *Cat*. 1 is described in *Att*. 2.1(21).3: *septima qua Catilinam emisi* ('the seventh [speech in the collection] by means of which I sent Catiline forth). D.R. Shackleton Bailey (*Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, vol. 1 [Cambridge, 1965]; *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*, vol. 1 [Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1999]) fails to capture the nuance of *qua* by translating 'when I sent Catiline out of Rome', as if Cicero had written *cum* instead. See F.X. Ryan, 'Anent the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000983 Published online by Cambridge University Press

described by Pliny, the *First Catilinarian* aptly illustrates his theme of how Cicero's orations influenced the actions of his audience, in this case the villain Catiline. It is also to be noted that in reporting Cicero's honorary title Pliny adopts the less common expression *parens patriae*, which is found as well at *Pis*. 6, as opposed to *pater patriae* at *Sest*. 121.[19] And although Pliny exaggerates by making it seem that the orator received the honour of a triumph, both Cicero (in describing his *supplicatio*) and Pliny (in describing the 'triumph') emphasize that Cicero was the first civilian to be so honoured (*mihi togato … singulari genere supplicationis*, *Pis*. 6).[20] Indeed, the extent to which Plin. *HN* 7.117 adheres to the same, or nearly the same, outline found in Cic. *Pis*. 4–6 makes it probable that Pliny drew upon that passage either directly or indirectly when he composed his list of Cicero's consular accomplishments. And if that is so, then the presence of Gaius (not Marcus) Antonius in Pliny's list is precisely what is expected and virtually assured as a correction.

Given what Cicero says about 'taming' (*mitigaui*) his colleague Antonius at *Pis*. 5, the verb *circumscribo* meaning to 'curtail' or 'curb' is ideally suited to describing at *HN* 7.117 Cicero's success in guarding against the threat posed by his colleague.[21] If we examine Pliny's use of *circumscribo,* we find that it occurs sixteen times, mostly in the literal sense of drawing a line around (*TLL* 3.1160.55–1161.12; *OLD* s.v. 1), but in at least one instance it is used in the figurative sense 'place restrictions on' (*TLL* 3.1161.74–1162.19; *OLD* s.v. 2b), the meaning that suits the text as emended at 7.117. At 22.4 Pliny speaks of 'curbing' luxury:

non est nunc propositum ista consectari nec omittemus[a] ut subiciendo uiliora[b] luxuriam utilitate[c] **circumscribamus**

[a] <c>om<m>ittemus *Mayoff post Erasmum* [b] *T*: utiliora *rell*. [c] *G*: vilitate *rell*.

It is not now my intention to go into such things in detail, but I shall not pass over them in silence so that I may **curb** luxury by substituting less expensive materials out of a consideration for expediency.

In Cicero's *Philippics*, as chance would have it, there are two sterling examples of *circumscribo* used in two slightly different but related senses to describe restrictions or curbs placed upon none other than the nephew of Antonius Hybrida, Marcus Antonius: (1) *Phil*. 2.53, the Senate's curtailment of Antonius' powers as tribune of the plebs in 49 (*TLL* 3.1162.22; *OLD* s.v. 5); and (2) *Phil*. 6.5, a physical barrier in the form of the Rubicon river and a two-hundred-mile limit set by the Senate in 43 (*TLL* 3.1160.56–7; *OLD* s.v. 2a).

The proposed emendation [*M.*] *Antonium* is ideally suited to balance *Catilina* unaccompanied by the praenomen Lucius in the preceding clause (*tuum Catilina fugit ingenium*), and Cicero similarly pairs the two names without *praenomina* in fr. 1 of

Ciceronian speech title *cum quaestor Lilybaeo decederet*', published online on 2016 at https://independent.academia.edu/FXRyan (consulted 30 November 2018), 1–5, at 5.

[19] Cf. Juv. 8.243–4, *sed Roma parentem*, | *Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit*. *Pater patriae* was the standard imperial title (*Dig*. 48.22.18.1).

[20] Cf. n. 5 above.

[21] In the context *of HN* 7.117, we can rule out the meaning 'cheat' or 'defraud' for *circumscribo* (*TLL* 3.1162.35–1163.31; *OLD* s.v. 6), since Pliny portrays all of Cicero's actions in a positive light.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000983 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In toga candida: *dico … domum Catilinam et Antonium cum sequestribus suis conuenisse* (in Asc. 83C).[22] Also, Cicero refers to Hybrida twice in the quotation above from *Pis*. 5 solely by his nomen Antonius.[23] A further, strong indicator that Pliny is likely to have written *Antonium* without a *praenomen* at 7.117 is the fact that Pliny shows a decided preference for omitting even M. Antonius' praenomen when there can be no doubt as to which Antonius he means.[24] Presumably the well-known fact that Antonius was Cicero's consular colleague (for example Plin. *Nat*. 8.213) made it unnecessary to write *C. Antonium* in a passage describing events exclusively in 63. The presence of the names Catilina and Antonius in short, successive clauses should have guaranteed perfect clarity in Pliny, just as it did in fr. 1 of Cicero's *In toga candida* quoted above.

What we need to bear in mind is that the presence of the word ***proscrip****torum* in Pliny, separated as it is by a mere ten words from the cognate *circum****scrip****sisti*, could easily have influenced the scribe to alter that verb to ***proscrip****sisti* through perseveration. The two words containing the common element *–scrip–* would have been no more that one line apart in a Carolingian MS and no more than three lines apart in an uncial. In addition, the juxtaposition of *Antonium* and the compound verb is likely to have fostered the perseveration by putting the scribe in mind of the proscriptions. The alteration of *circumscripsisti* to *proscripsisti* under the influence of *proscriptorum* just above was almost inevitable, if the scribe had already jumped to the false conclusion that Antonius was Marcus Antonius, who was notorious for bringing about Cicero's brutal murder in the proscriptions. That train of thought can explain the insertion of *M.* to supply the unexpressed praenomen of *Antonium*, without any thought being given to how contradictory it makes the statement. A more radical reversal of historical roles is hard to imagine. One might almost say that it rises to the level of crediting Caesar with the murder of Marcus Brutus.

The assertion that Cicero proscribed Marcus Antonius, given its context in the midst of deeds performed by Cicero as consul in 63, is surely a red herring. It is a monstrosity resulting from a scribal error owed to perseveration, compounded by a misguided supplement (*M.*). The proscription of M. Antonius by Cicero deserves no place in Pliny or in any other text. Rather, it is long overdue to restore to Pliny's survey of Cicero's consular deeds the wholly appropriate and expected reference to Cicero's success in preventing his colleague Gaius Antonius from tipping the balance in Catiline's favour.

University of Illinois at Chicago JOHN T. RAMSEY
jtramsey@uic.edu

[22] 'I state that Catiline and Antonius met with their bribery agents at the house …'.
[23] *ego Antonium conlegam* and *quam cum Antonio commutaui*.
[24] Leaving *aside HN* 7.117, out of the eighteen passages listed under *M. Antonius* in the Teubner index (see n. 8 above) that refer to the triumvir by name, twelve style him *Antonius* without praenomen (7.55, 7.147, 9.119, 10.110, 21.12, 32.3, 33.50, 33.82, 33.132, 34.6, 34.58, 37.81), against only half that number in which the *praenomen* is expressed (2.99, 8.55, 14.147, 19.22, 31.11, 35.200).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000983 Published online by Cambridge University Press