

## C. Licinius Macer Calvus, fr. 18 Büchner\*

Pierre Pithou printed among his *Epigrammata et poematia uetera* of 1590:

C. LICINII CALVI IN CN. POMPEIUM

Magnus quem metuunt omnes, digito caput uno  
scalpit. quid credas hunc sibi uelle? uirum<sup>1</sup>.

Edward Courtney recently presented the distich in the same form<sup>2</sup>. As indeed had previous collectors of poetic fragments between Pithou's time and his own<sup>3</sup>. Both Pithou and Courtney appear to have accepted the view of the Juvenalian scholiast that the distich constitutes an entire epigram. The latter made the substance of Calvus' accusation 'Pompey is so effeminate that he does not wish to disturb his locks'<sup>4</sup>, thus again remaining in the tracks of his predecessors<sup>5</sup>. However, while

---

\* I am grateful to Giorgio Bernardi Perini and his Paduan colleagues for a helpfully critical discussion of the theses of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> *Epigrammata et poematia uetera. Quorum pleraque nunc primum ex antiquis codicibus & lapidibus, alia sparsim antehac errantia, iam undecumque collecta emendatiora eduntur*, Paris 1590, 78 (among the *uituperia & scommata*).

<sup>2</sup> *The Fragmentary Latin Poets. Edited with Commentary*, Oxford 1993, 210.

<sup>3</sup> See P. Burman, jun., *Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poematum*, I, Amsterdam 1759, 215-16; J.A. Weichert, *De C. Licinio Caluo oratore et poeta*, Progr. Grimma 1825, 32-4 (= *Poetarum Latinorum Hostii, Laeuii, C. Licinii Calui, C. Heluii Cinnae, C. Valgii Rufi, Domitii Marsi aliorumque uitae et carminum reliquiae*, Leipzig 1830, 132-5); K. Lachmann, *Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis liber*, Berlin 1829, 81; H. Meyer, *Anthologia ueterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poematum*, I, Leipzig 1835, 18; L. Mueller, *Catulli Tibulli Propertii carmina*, Leipzig 1870, 75; E. Baehrens, *Fragmenta poetarum Romanorum*, Leipzig 1886, 322; F. Plessis, *C. Licini Calui reliquiae*, Paris 1896, 12-13; W. Morel, *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium*, Leipzig 1927, 86-7; A. Traglia, *Poetae noui*, Rome 1962, 70 (1974<sup>2</sup>, 74); J. Granarolo, «ANRW» I/3 (1973) 344; K. Büchner, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, Leipzig 1982, 112. Cf. C. Pascal, *Poeti e personaggi catulliani*, Catania 1916, 21-3; O. Weinreich, *Die Distichen des Catull*, Tübingen 1926, 18; F. Münzer, *C. Licinius Macer Calvus*, «RE» XIII/1 (1926) 432-3; E. Castorina, *Licinio Calvo*, Catania 1946, 78-9; H. Bardon, *La littérature latine inconnue. Tome I. L'époque républicaine*, Paris 1952, 344; T.P. Wiseman, *Catullus and his World; A Reappraisal*, Cambridge 1985, 37 and n. 76.

<sup>4</sup> *L.c.* n. 2. Cf. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London 1980, 441: 'cinaedi ... who do not wish to disturb their locks'.

<sup>5</sup> Cf., e.g., Plessis, *Calvi Rel.* (n. 3), 12: 'se gratter la tête du bout de doigt suppose que

most editors of Seneca's *Controuersiae* have altered *quo credas* to *quid credas*, Lennart Håkanson keeps the paradosis<sup>6</sup>. Likewise, in editing the scholia to Juvenal and Lucan, Paul Wessner<sup>7</sup> and G.J. Cavajoni<sup>8</sup> respectively keep *metuunt homines* and *quid dicas*. Although Calvus' contemporary and friend Catullus composed one-distich epigrams<sup>9</sup>, as did Martial more than a century later<sup>10</sup>, it may be pointed out that the scholium to Lucan leaves the question of the size of Calvus' epigram about Pompey open. The gesture attributed by Calvus to the general is not one which could avoid disturbing a careful coiffure, *scalpere* suggests a much more vigorous act than would, say, *scabere*<sup>11</sup>. In any case Pompey took little trouble with his hair<sup>12</sup>. Ancient effeminacy assumed a variety of forms, which were variously judged. What is imputed in the second sentence of the distich, however it is punctuated, has an odour much worse than anything mere attention to the arrangement of the hair<sup>13</sup> could suggest. The form of the question created by Scaliger<sup>14</sup> and accepted by Pithou – *quid credas hunc sibi uelle?* – both limits unduly the range of significance that might be perceived in an act of scratching the head and

l'on craint de déranger sa chevelure et témoigne d'un souci efféminé de la toilette, et de la tenue, qui ne convient pas à un général, à un chef de parti'; Pascal, *Poeti* (n. 3), 22 n. 3: 'lo *scalpere caput uno digito* era proprio dei cinedi, che non volevano guastare la molle scriminatura dei capelli'; Bardon, *La littérature* (n. 3), 344: 'c'est le geste des efféminés, qui ne veulent pas déranger leur chevelure'. The doctrine stems from an ancient commentator's attempt to explain Juvenal 9,133 and from misunderstanding of Plut. *Caes.* 4,9. For the doctrine that we have the whole epigram cf. H. Tränkle, «MH» XXIV (1967) 87.

<sup>6</sup> L. Annaeus Seneca Maior, *Oratorum et Rhetorum sententiae, diuisiones, colores*, rec. L.H., Leipzig 1989, 196. So too Froben's editor (1515), Herwagen's editor (1557), and N. Le Fèvre (1587). M.-A. Muret in the Roman edition (1585) omitted, doubtless on moral grounds, *quo credas hunc sibi uelle uirum* entirely. On the other hand, A. Schott (1604), J.F. Gronov (1649), the Bipontine editor (1783), C. Bursian (1857), A. Kiessling (1872), H.J. Mueller (1887), H. Bornecque (1902), M. Winterbottom (1974), and A. Zanon Dal Bo (1987) took up Scaliger's suggestion and printed *quid credas*.

<sup>7</sup> *Scholia in Iuuenalem uetustiora*, Leipzig 1931, 161 in app.

<sup>8</sup> *Supplementum Adnotationum super Lucanum. Libri VI-VII*, Milan 1984, 132-3.

<sup>9</sup> 85, 93, 94, 105, 106, 112.

<sup>10</sup> I 5, 9, 16, 28, 30, 32, 37, 38, 40, 45, 47, 50, 56, 63, 67, 69, 74, 75, 80, 81, 83, 91, 94, 95, 98, 100, 102, 110, 112, 118 *et al.*

<sup>11</sup> The vigour of the act may be deduced from Plaut. *Aul.* 467-8 *ubi erat haec defossa, occepit ibi scalpurrere ungulis / circumcirca*. For *caput scabere* see Lucil. 883, Hor. *Serm.* I 10,71.

<sup>12</sup> See Plut. *Pomp.* 2,2, Lucan VIII 679-80, Sil. XIII 861-2. Contrast what is said of Caesar's hair (Plut. *Caes.* 4,9).

<sup>13</sup> For the sort of male who attends to his hair see Plaut. *Asin.* 627, Cic. *Catil.* 2,22, P. *red. in sen.* 16, Hor. *Epod.* 11,28, Manil. V 146-9, Tib. I 8,9-10, Ov. *Ars* III 433-4, Sen. *Contr.* V 6, Sen. *Dial.* X 12,3, *Epist.* 95,24 and 115,2, Quint. *Inst.* I 6,44, Mart. III 63,3, *Priap.* 45, Plut. *Mor.* fr. 181 (Gell. III 5), Juv. 2,96, Lucian, *Rh. Pr.* 11.

<sup>14</sup> *Publii Virgilii Maronis appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum Poematum ueterum Poetarum*, Lyons 1572, 222.

demands that *credas* be given something like the sense of *putes* or *arbitreris*. Everything about the conventionally accepted text of the distich and its interpretation thus requires to be reconsidered.

Some elements of the text established themselves in print before all the evidence was known. Politian knew only the incomplete citation made by Seneca at *Contr.* VII 4,7:

et carmina quoque eius [i.e. Calui] quamuis iocosa sint [*Politian*: iocasa sit **AB**: ioca sint **V**], plena sunt ingentis animi, dicit de Pompeio:

digito caput uno

scalpit, quo credas hunc sibi uelle uirum.

While preparing lectures on the *Satires* of Juvenal<sup>15</sup> he perceived a verbal similarity, indeed a specific allusion, in the sarcastic prophecy at 9,130-3:

ne trepida, numquam pathicus tibi derit amicus  
stantibus et saluis his collibus: undique ad illos  
conuenient et carpentis et nauibus omnes  
qui digito scalpunt uno caput<sup>16</sup>.

Seneca's work was not readily available in late fifteenth-century Florence, and the only ancient comment on 9,133 to hand – *cinaedi, cum muliebri more componunt caput* – missed the satirist's pungency. The commentaries of Domizio Calderini (1473) and Giorgio Merula (1478) were silent. Thus it was, in Politian's view, worth pointing out something rather obvious. He also drew attention to Plutarch's account of how in 56 B.C. Clodius and his followers ridiculed the unprecedentedly successful general's inability to control a political situation:

τέλος δὲ προελθόντος αὐτοῦ πρὸς τινὰ δίκην, ἔχων ὑφ' αὐτῷ πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων ἀσελγείας καὶ ὀλιγωρίας μεστόν, αὐτὸς μὲν εἰς ἐπιφανῆ τόπον καταστάς, ἐρωτήματα τοιαῦτα προὔβαλε· 'τίς ἐστὶν αὐτοκράτωρ ἀκόλαστος; τίς ἀνὴρ ἄνδρα ζητεῖ; τίς ἐνὶ δακτύλῳ κνᾶται τὴν κεφαλὴν;' οἱ δ' ὥσπερ χορὸς εἰς ἀμοιβαῖα συγκεκροτημένος, ἐκείνου τὴν τήβεννον ἀνασεύοντος, ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ μέγα βοῶντες ἀπεκρίναντο· 'Πομπήιος',<sup>17</sup>

to a reference by the same Plutarch to the accusation in question as being false but potentially indicative of a related shortcoming on Pompey's part

δεῖ δ' ἀκούσαντα κακῶς ὑπ' ἐχθροῦ τὸ μὲν προσὸν ἀφαιρεῖν αὐτοῦ ... ἂν δέ τις λέγῃ τὰ μὴ προσόντα, ὅμως ζητεῖν <τὴν> αἰτίαν ἀφ' ἧς ἡ βλασφημία γέγονε καὶ φυλάττεσθαι καὶ δεδιέναι μή τι λανθάνωμεν ἢ

<sup>15</sup> Delivered in 1485-86. See I. Maïer, *Ange Politien. La formation d'un poète humaniste (1469-1480)*, Geneva 1966, 426-7; A.F. Verde, *Lo studio fiorentino 1473-1503*, II, Florence 1973, 26-7; IV 2, Florence 1985, 632-9. The discussion of 9,130-3 appears at *Miscellaneorum centuria prima*, Florence 1489, n. 7.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Sen. *Contr.* X 1,8.

<sup>17</sup> *Pomp.* 48,11-12. Cf. Cic. *Fam.* I 5b, a, *Q. fr.* II 3,2, Dio Cass. XXXIX 19,1-2. Plutarch and Dio evidently draw on the same source.

σύνεγγυς ἢ ὅμοιον τῷ λεγομένῳ παραμαρτάνοντες. οἶον ... διέβαλε, καὶ Πομπήιον τὸ ἐνὶ κνᾶσθαι δακτύλῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν πορρωτάτῳ θηλύτητος καὶ ἀκολασίας ὄντα<sup>18</sup>

and to a passage in which Ammianus Marcellinus illustrates the unjust accusations which statesmen have to face by those brought by Pompey's detractors:

nec non etiam in Pompeium obtrectatores iniqui, multa scrutantes, cum nihil unde uituperari deberet inueniretur, duo haec obseruarunt ludibriosa et inrita: quod genuino quodam more caput digito uno scalpebat, quodque aliquamdiu tegundi ulceris causa deformis fasciola candida crus colligatum gestabat; quorum alterum factitare ut dissolutum, alterum ut nouarum rerum cupidum adserebant; nihil interesse oblatrantes argumento subfrigido, quam partem corporis redimiret regiae maiestatis insigni: eum uirum quo nec fortior nec amantior quisquam patriae fuit, ut documenta praeclara testantur<sup>19</sup>.

The evidence then available could not have been better presented.

After returning from his travels abroad with Louis Chasteigner de la Rochepozay in 1567 Joseph Scaliger put together as a supplement to an edition of the *Appendix vergiliana*<sup>20</sup> various old poems attributed to other authors which he called *Catalecta*. He used the rich resources of the library of another highly placed friend, the Pierre Pithou mentioned earlier. Where the words cited by Seneca from Calvus' poem were concerned, he supplemented them to form an elegiac distich with the aid of Ammianus' account of the accusations made against Pompey (... *fasciola candida crus colligatum gestabat*) and altered *quo* to *quid*, as the Estiennes had done in 1564<sup>21</sup>. Thus:

fasciculo qui crura ligat, digito caput uno  
scalpit; quid credas hunc sibi uelle uirum?

In discussion with Pithou he allowed the possibility of *quo credas* ... but maintained a preference for *quid credas* ...? pointing out that, according to Ammianus, the wearing of a *fasciola candida* seemed to signify desire for monarchical power, the scratching of the head sexual inversion. The troubles of 1567 and 1568 prevented publication of the collection in Paris as he desired. He made a further revision and had it printed in Lyons in 1572<sup>22</sup>. The distich in question appeared as

<sup>18</sup> *Mor.* 89d-e. See also 800d.

<sup>19</sup> XVII 11,4. Sections 2-4 evidently have the same source as *Plut. Mor.* 800d. Pompey in fact covered both shanks (*Cic. Att.* II 3,1).

<sup>20</sup> See J. Bernays, *Joseph Justus Scaliger*, Berlin 1855, 273-4, A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, I, Oxford 1983, 285 nn. 119-121 on *Epistolae* 31-34 (Leiden 1627, 136-44).

<sup>21</sup> R. & H. Stephanus, *Fragmenta Poetarum veterum Latinorum quorum opera non extant*, [Geneva] 1564, 411.

<sup>22</sup> See above, n. 14.



fasciola qui crura ligat, digito caput uno  
scalpit, quid credas hunc sibi uelle? uirum

under the rubric C. LICINII CALVI IN CN. POMPEIUM. The new punctuation was clearly inspired not only by the series of questions and answers reported by Plutarch at *Pomp.* 48, 11-12 but also by the model of Martial's pointedness<sup>23</sup>. Scaliger would now have decided that Ammianus was mistaken over the precise significance attributed to the general's white leggings<sup>24</sup>. The rubric shows that he thought the distich to constitute the whole of the original poem. Soon after 1572 he became aware of the set of scholia to Lucan which cited the whole distich as

Magnus quem metuunt omnes digito caput uno  
scalpit quid dicas hunc sibi uelle uirum<sup>25</sup>

but did not entirely withdraw his conjectural supplement<sup>26</sup>. When Pithou himself came to publish his own collection he printed the text of the scholium, replacing *omnes* with *homines* and *dicas* with *credas* but otherwise leaving intact Scaliger's final view of what Calvus wanted to say. The clear-headed openness to other possibilities which Scaliger showed between 1567 and 1574 contrasts with the unthinking acceptance of a single text which has prevailed from 1590 to the present day.

The scholium to Lucan. VII 726 which is found in codd. Paris, B.N. lat. 7900 A (A), Berlin, Staatsbibl. lat. fol. 35 (D), and Munich, Staatsbibl. cml 14505 (R) reads as follows:

NUNC TIBI VERA F. duobus uitiis Pompeius laborabat, nam et fauoribus multum gaudebat, ut in primo ipse Lucanus 'famaeque petitor multa dare in uulgius totusque popularibus auris impelli' (I 131-3) et uitio superbiae quodam modo tangebatur; nam uno digito caput scalpebat, quod est superbiae indicium, unde Martialis de eo in epigrammate 'Magnus quem metuunt homines, digito caput uno scalpit quid dicas hunc sibi uelle uirum'.

quidam autem luxuriae esse uitium dicunt uno digito scalpere caput, ut Iuuenalis 'nunquam pathicus deerit amicus stantibus et saluis his collibus; undique ad illos conueniunt et carpentis et nauibus omnes qui digito scalpunt uno caput' (9,130-3)<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> For the one-word reply to a question ending an epigram see I 10, II 17; 56, III 20, IX 4.

<sup>24</sup> On the *fasciae* of Alexander Severus see C. Saumaise, *Historiae Augustae Scriptores* VI, Paris 1620, 221-4 (comm. on *Alex.* 40,11); on those worn by the disguised C. Clodius see C. Beier, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationum pro Tullio, in Clodium, pro Scauro, pro Flacco fragmenta inedita*, Leipzig 1825, 104-5; women wore them (see *Cic. Har. resp.* 44); likewise the sick (*Hor. Serm.* II 3,244-5, *Quint. Inst.* XI 3,144). In olden days young boys did not (*Varro ap. Non.* p. 180-24).

<sup>25</sup> Probably in what is now cod. Paris, B.N. lat. 7900 A.

<sup>26</sup> See *Ausoniarum lectionum libri duo*, Lyons 1574, 77-9. He punctuated the second verse of the distich with a stop after *scalpit* and a question mark after *uelle*.

<sup>27</sup> Codd. Wolfenbüttel, Herz. Aug. Bibl. 41 and Leiden, Univ. Bibl. Voss. Q 51 omit

It falls clearly into two parts, the part from *quidam autem luxuriae* being a correction by a second commentator.

Carl Hosius drew attention in 1888 to a scholium to Juv. 9,133 in cod. Leiden, Bibl. d. Rijkuniv. B.P.L. 82:

signum infamium est uno digito caput scalpere quod uitium habuit Magnus Pompeius, ut de eo Martialis tale epigramma fecerit 'Magnum quem metuunt homines digito caput uno scalpit quid dicas hunc sibi uelle uirum'<sup>28</sup>.

Willy Morel did not, however, take any notice when he revised Baehrens' *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* in 1927. Paul Wessner pointed out in 1931 the presence of the same scholium in codd. Leiden, Bibl. d. Rijkuniv. Voss. F 64 and Paris, B.N. lat. 8070<sup>29</sup>, but Karl Büchner and others again took no notice. The false attribution of the distich to Martial clearly links the two scholia to each other, and it was Wessner's view that the distich had originally been cited by an ancient commentator on Juv. 9,133 and that at some time in the Middle Ages the commentator's note moved from the margin of a manuscript of Juvenal to the margin of a manuscript of Lucan. Courtney decided that as a result of Wessner's observations collectors of fragments need henceforth take no notice of the Lucan scholium. The matter is more complex.

The Juvenal scholium makes an apt and instructive comment on the passage in question, while the account in the Lucan scholium of Pompey's two alleged vices, love of popular favour and arrogance, help us little with the poet's sententiousness in regard to the attitude of the populace of Larisa to the great general's final defeat:

auehit inde  
Pompeium sonipes; gemitus lacrimaeque secuntur  
plurimaque in saeuos populi conuicia diuos.  
nunc tibi uera fides quaesiti Magne fauoris  
contigit ac fructus; felix se nescit amari<sup>30</sup>.

The notion that the distich accused Pompey of arrogance is absurd, as indeed the person who added the words *quidam autem luxuriae ... uno caput* realised. Nevertheless the theme of the two vices, one illustrated by a citation of Lucan himself, the other by the distich, hangs together and cannot be entirely a medieval creation. Wessner's theory that the source of the scholia in the Lucan manuscripts drew on the source of those in the Juvenal manuscripts for the substance of *unde Martialis*

---

Lucan I 131-3 and Calvus' distich. F. Oudendorp edited this scholium and its companions in 1728, C.F. Weber in 1831. See now, G.A. Cavajoni, *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum, Libri I-V*, Milan 1979, IX-XLII; *Libri VI-VII* (n. 8), 132.

<sup>28</sup> *Apparatus criticus ad Iuuenalem*, Bonn 1888, 99.

<sup>29</sup> *Scholia* (n. 7), 275-6.

<sup>30</sup> VII 723-7. Demagoguery was conventionally associated with effeminacy; see Ar. *Eq.* 877-80, *Nub.* 1093-4, fr. 687, Eup. fr. 104 K.-A., Diog. Laert. VI 34 (on Diogenes and Demosthenes).

... *scalpunt uno caput* takes no account of the alleged link between *superbia* and head scratching or of the polemical character of *quaedam autem luxuriae* ... It may be significant that Ammianus reported two vices unjustly attributed to Pompey<sup>31</sup>, the first being clearly the one alluded to in the distich<sup>32</sup>. I should suggest accordingly that some biography of Pompey citing Calvus' lampoon<sup>33</sup> was used by Ammianus' source, by an ancient commentator on Lucan<sup>34</sup>, and by an ancient commentator on Juvenal, that the historian obliterated the verses while the version used by the commentators made a wrong guess about the name of the author, and that in the course of the transmission of the comment on the passage of Lucan monarchical ambition turned into currying favour with the people and sexual passivity into arrogance.

It may also be speculated that Calvus' lampoon struck not only at Pompey's nervous mannerism of scratching his head but also at the leggings by means of which he concealed an unsightly sore, seeing in the former a sign of a desire for an active male sexual partner and in the latter a sign of wanting to establish a Parthian style kingship in Republican Rome<sup>35</sup>. The distich we have would in that case not have stood alone. At all events the manifest errors of the tradition debar hasty credence in the Juvenalian scholiast's *ut de eo ... tale epigramma fecerit*.

The two texts transmitted can both be defended. Palaeography has no explanation for their diversity. The fundamental question, not squarely faced by a Pithou still mesmerised by Scaliger's brilliance or by the great majority of scholars since Pithou's time, is: what was changed to what? *quo credas* to *quid dicas*? or *quid dicas* to *quo credas*?

<sup>31</sup> W. Drumann and P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung*, III, Leipzig 1906, 662 n. 5, IV, *ibid.* 1908, 545, and E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus*, Stuttgart-Berlin 1922<sup>3</sup>, 132 n. 1, mention Pompey's unfortunate mannerism. Recent historians (e.g. M. Gelzer, *Pompeius*, Munich 1949<sup>2</sup> [1944<sup>1</sup>]; J. van Ooteghem, *Pompée le Grand, bâtisseur d'empire*, Brussels 1954; A.M. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the Late Republic*, Columbia-London 1977; R. Seager, *Pompey: A Political Biography*, Oxford 1979; P. Greenhalgh, *Pompey: The Republican Prince*, London 1981) appear to ignore the whole matter.

<sup>32</sup> For Pompey's φιλοτιμία and φιλαρχία see Vell. II 33,2-3, Plut. *Pomp.* 30,6-8; 38,1. It was no large step to accuse him of seeking a new and un-Roman kind of authority (see Val. Max. VI 2,6; 9, Plut. *Pomp.* 43,1; 67,5).

<sup>33</sup> Of the earlier authors cited by Plutarch in his biography of Pompey only C. Oppius (10,7-9) would seem to qualify as a possibility. Theophanes (37,4 *et al.*) and Timagenes (49,13) wrote in Greek. The *Historiae* of Asinius Pollio (72,4) would not have cited verses. Ammianus' ultimate source can be taken back into the first century (see above, n. 19).

<sup>34</sup> The scholia to Lucan are not the most erudite among the extant sets of ancient exegesis and have suffered much medieval alteration, but they contain, for example, a verse of Ennius' *Annals* and fragments of Lucilius and Varro of Atax which must have been adduced in Antiquity (*Comment. Bern* I 6, V 672, *Adnot.* III 237).

<sup>35</sup> The leggings attracted comments (Cic. *Att.* II 3,1) and jests (for that by M. Favonius see Val. Max. VI 2,7).

The text presenting a complete distich may be considered first. The observed habits of scribes offer no hindrance to a change of *homines* to *omnes*<sup>36</sup>. On the other hand it has to be asked whether such a change is necessary. *Homines* frequently functions in the sense of 'people in general', 'die Leute', as for example at Plaut. *Capt.* 78 *quom rus homines eunt*, Stich. 606 *quam efflicentur homines noctu hic in uia*, 640 *ut me esse homines mortuum dicant fame*<sup>37</sup>. Here it could even be said to serve for *genus humanum*, 'human beings', 'ordinary men as opposed to gods'. The *cognomen* 'Magnus', bestowed on Pompey by his troops after one of his early victories<sup>38</sup>, suggested someone of superhuman strength and spirit. It was commonly applied to gods – e.g. in the phrases *di magni*<sup>39</sup> and *magne Iuppiter*<sup>40</sup> – and only quite rarely to human beings, even in regard to physical size<sup>41</sup>. Pompey himself liked to be called 'Magnus', but many members of the ruling class used the new *cognomen*, if they used it at all, with a tone of heavy irony<sup>42</sup>. Calvus brings the semi-divine *Magnus quem metuunt homines* suddenly down to earth with *digito caput uno scalpit*<sup>43</sup>. Perhaps lower. Men of state with a proper sense of public decorum knew what to do with their hands<sup>44</sup>.

The words *quid dicas hunc sibi uelle uirum* have been punctuated in two ways: with a question mark after *uirum*<sup>45</sup> and with one after *uelle*<sup>46</sup>. Two other ways are at least theoretically possible: with such a mark after both *uelle* and *uirum* and with one after both *quid* and *uirum*.

Against *quid dicas hunc sibi uelle? uirum* can be brought one of the same objections I have already adumbrated against Scaliger's *quid credas hunc sibi*

<sup>36</sup> At *Poen.* 979 **A** has *omnes* wrongly for *homines* (*hominis* **P**). At *Trin.* 29 on the other hand it has *homines* wrongly for *omnes* (*omnis* **P**).

<sup>37</sup> See further *ThLL* VI/3, 2880,65-2881,69.

<sup>38</sup> Probably in 81 in Africa (Plin. *NH* VII 96, Plut. *Pomp.* 13,8). Some believed it to have been in 79 (Plut. *Pomp.* 13,7-8), others in 61 (Liv. *Per.* 103, App. *Mithr.* 118, 121; but note Dio Cass. XXXVII 21,3).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Plaut. *Cist.* 522, *Truc.* 701, Catull. 14,12; 53,5; 109-3.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 1163, Ter. *Eun.* 709; also Plaut. *Aul.* 776, Ter. *Ad.* 714.

<sup>41</sup> Note Cic. *Nat. Deor.* II 167 *nemo igitur uir magnus sine aliquo adflatu diuino umquam fuit*.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Caelius, Cic. *Fam.* VIII 13,2 (50). Elsewhere Caelius refers to Pompey as 'Pompeius'. On Cicero's various ways of addressing and referring to Pompey see J.N. Adams, «CQ» n.s. XXVIII (1978) 160-1. It seems to have been in 77 that Pompey had begun signing letters and decrees with 'Magnus' (Plut. *Pomp.* 13,9).

<sup>43</sup> There can hardly be a contrast between *homines* and *uirum* (either in the sense of 'real male' or in that of 'virility'; so, already before Courtney, Tränkle, «MH» XXIV [1967] 87 n. 1).

<sup>44</sup> Noteworthy is what Cicero (e.g. *De orat.* III 220, *Orat.* 59) and Quintilian (e.g. *Inst.* XI 3, 117-24) warn against when talking of gestures with the hands and fingers.

<sup>45</sup> So R. Étienne (n. 21).

<sup>46</sup> So J.J. Scaliger (n. 14).



uelle? uirum. It is clear that Pompey had a nervous habit of scratching his head vigorously with one finger and that many noticed this<sup>47</sup>. It is equally clear that males of conventional dignity kept their fingers away from their heads<sup>48</sup>. Females on the other hand would have been allowed to adjust their coiffures without comment<sup>49</sup>. The motives commonly seen for a male scratching his head were many and various. Aeschines describes Demosthenes in 345 making strange gesticulations and rubbing his head before addressing a speech to the Athenian people which pretended bewilderment he did not feel<sup>50</sup>. The fourth-century comic poet Timocles describes a man who has had his baggage stolen scratching his head in bewilderment:

διὰ τί Τηρέα λέγεις;  
 :: διότι τηρεῖν δεῖ παρόντος τοῦδε τὰ σκεύη σφόδρα·  
 εἰ δὲ μή, Πρόκνη γενήσῃ κνώμενος τὸ κρανίον,  
 ἂν ἀπολέσῃς<sup>51</sup>.

Horace has a poet unable to form a fully satisfactory verse scratching his head<sup>52</sup>. Apuleius portrays a young man on trial for his life seeming to betray a guilty conscience through shifting his stance constantly, scratching first one part of his head and then another, and stammering with his mouth half shut<sup>53</sup>. John Chrysostom describes a group of Christians unable to rebut the arguments of pagan sceptics, looking downwards, scratching themselves and gaping open-mouthed<sup>54</sup>. Scratching one's ear passed into proverb<sup>55</sup>. Nowhere in the passages I have referred to is there a hint of positive effeminacy of any kind. This theme does, however, appear at Seneca, *Epist.* 52,12, where the markers of sexual inversion are described:

... argumentum morum ex minimis quoque licet capere: inpudicum et  
 incessus ostendit et manus mota et unum interdum responsum et relatus  
 ad caput digitus et flexus oculorum

at Juv. 9,131-3, where the very wording of Calvus' distich is used in a reference to the whole class of invert:

undique ad illos  
 conuenient et carpentis et nauibus omnes  
 qui digito scalpunt uno caput

<sup>47</sup> To the passages of Plutarch noted above add Julian, *Caes.* 323b.

<sup>48</sup> See above n. 44.

<sup>49</sup> On the effeminacy of males doing so see above n. 13. The point of Herod. 4,50-1 has so far eluded commentators.

<sup>50</sup> 2,49. Quintilian permits the gesture at the beginning of a speech (*Inst.* XI 3,158).

<sup>51</sup> Fr. 19,2-6 K.-A.

<sup>52</sup> *Serm.* I 10,70-1. Cf. the act of the *scriba* described by Cicero at *Pis.* 61 (*caput sinistra manu perfricans*).

<sup>53</sup> *Met.* X 10.

<sup>54</sup> *Homil.* 17 in *Eu. Iohann.* 4 (PG LIX 111).

<sup>55</sup> Lucian, *Bis acc.* 1. Cf. Apul. *Met.* VI 9, Don. *ad Ter. Phorm.* 315, Heliod. II 8.



at Plut. *Caes.* 4,9, where a remark by Cicero about a misleading aspect of Julius Caesar's demeanour in youth is reported:

ἀλλ' ὅταν ... τὴν κόμην οὕτω διακειμένην περιττῶς ἴδω, κάκεινον ἐνὶ δακτύλῳ κνόμενον, οὗ μοι δοκεῖ πάλιν οὗτος ἄνθρωπος εἰς νοῦν ἂν ἐμβαλέσθαι τηλικούτον κακόν, ἀναίρεσιν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας

at Pomp. 48,11-12, where Clodius' denunciation of Pompey as an ἀκόλαστος is described (see above, p. 245); at *Mor.* 89e, where it is a question of alleged θηλότης and ἀκολασία (see above, pp. 245s.); at *Mor.* 800d, where the small-minded carping of Pompey's political enemies is described:

Πομπήιον δὲ Μᾶγνον ἐλοιδόρουν οἱ ἐχθροί, παραφυλάξαντες ἐνὶ δακτύλῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν κνόμενον

at Lucian, *Rh. Pr.* 11, where the features of an effeminate sophist are listed:

... εὐρήσεις ... καὶ πάγκαλον ἄνδρα, διασεσαλευμένον τὸ βάδισμα, ἐπικεκλασμένον τὸν αὐχένα, γυναικεῖον τὸ βλέμμα, μελιχρὸν τὸ φώνημα, μύρων ἀποπνέοντα, τῷ δακτύλῳ ἄκρῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν κνόμενον, ὀλίγας μὲν ἔτι, οὐλας δὲ καὶ ὑακινθίνας τὰς τρίχας εὐθετίζοντα, πάνταβρόν τινα Σαρδανάπαλλον ἢ Κινύραν ἢ αὐτὸν Ἀγάθωνα, τὸν τῆς τραγωιδίας ἐπέραστον ἐκείνον ποιητήν

and at Julian, *Caes.* 323b, where Alexander makes light of Caesar's defeat of Pompey:

οὐδὲν οὖν θαυμαστόν, εἰ κεκράτηκας Πομπηίου δακτύλῳ κνωμένου καὶ τᾶλλα ἀλώπεκος μᾶλλον ἢ λέοντος.

Given the multitude of ways in which Pompey's nervous habit could have been interpreted or misinterpreted, a question about what the general wanted made no point, even if it was immediately followed by an answer embodying a gross insult. A greater directness was required. Hence I should propose that the words be punctuated as *quid? dicas hunc sibi uelle uirum?* For the absence of an interrogative particle in the second question there are many parallels: e.g. Plaut. *Amph.* 52-3 *quid? contraxistis frontem quia tragoediam / dixi futuram hanc?*; *Men.* 924 *quid? tu me locustam censes esse, homo ignauissime?*; *Rud.* 842-3 *quid? ego quasi canem / hominem insectarer lapidibus nequissimum?*; 1074 *quid? tu idem mihi uis fieri quod erus consuevit tibi?*; 1270 *quid? patri etiam gratulabor quom illam inuenit*; Cic. *Fam.* VII 32,1 *quid? tu id pateris?*; XI 21,1 *quid? tu illum tecum solum aut cum Caesare* (sc. *locutum esse putas*)? There would have been little ambiguity in *sibi*<sup>56</sup> *uelle uirum*: cf. Ov. *Ars* I 524 *si qui male uir quaerit habere uirum*; Plut. *Pomp.* 48,11 τίς ἀνὴρ ἄνδρα ζητεῖ; Lucian, *Pseudol.* 28 οὐκ ἂν προσείμην ... ἄνδρα καὶ αὐτὸν ἀνδρὸς δεόμενον.

The transmitted *dicas* can stand alongside Ter. *Eun.* 460 *ex homine hunc*

<sup>56</sup> For the apparently otiose reflexive cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 1028 *quid nunc uis tibi?*, *Aul.* 636, *Bacch.* 586, *Mil.* 1050, *Poen.* 152, 324, 414, *Pseud.* 1147, Ter. *Haut.* 61, *Eun.* 559, 798, 804, 1007, *Phorm.* 946, Varro, *Men.* 217.

*natum dicas?*; Cic. *Fam.* XV 19,1 ... *ut Catium Athenis natum esse dicas*; Att. XV 29,2 *mirus ciuis ut tu Fauonium Asinium dicas*; Prop. III 7,34 *quid meritum dicas, cui sua terra parum est?*; Pers. 3,9 *ut pecuaria rudere dicas* (some witnesses and editors: *credas* others); *Priap.* 43,1-2 *uelle quid hanc dicas ... hastam ...?* The generalising potential subjunctive governing an accusative and infinitive makes the question *\*hic sibi uirum uult?* a very tentative one. Martial, it may be conceded, concluded his epigrams more forcibly, but we are dealing with an author almost certainly closer to Catullus in style, and in any case, there is no certainty that the original epigram itself ended with *uirum*.

Doubt has already above been cast on the notion that Calvus was accusing Pompey merely of 'not wishing to disturb his locks'. The material for solving the problem, namely the statement made by the old man of Plautus' *Bacchides* as he is enticed by a woman – *caput prurit, perii, uix negito*<sup>57</sup>, was provided as long ago as 1890 by Kurt Sittl<sup>58</sup>. R.B. Onians explained in 1951 the way of thinking which connected lust with the head<sup>59</sup>. Pompey was notorious for his lustfulness in regard to women<sup>60</sup>, itself a sign of unmanliness<sup>61</sup>, but Calvus' epigrammatic suggestion went further. The finger with which the nervous Pompey scratched his head must have been the middle one, the one which both Greeks<sup>62</sup> and Romans<sup>63</sup> pointed at sexual inverts and men whose moral defects could be associated with inversion.

We may now turn to Seneca the Elder's citation of the distich. The transmitted text should stand. And certainly in editions of Seneca's work. I cannot find *credas* as a generalising potential subjunctive in an interrogative statement in any of the authors I have examined. On the other hand the form occurs frequently in indicative statements and consecutive clauses: e.g. Ter. *Haut.* 1063 *credas animum ibi esse*; Acc. *Trag.* 395 *interruptum credas nimbum uoluier*; Lucr. IV 318-19 *indugredi porro pariter simulacra pedemque / ponere nobiscum credas gestumque*

<sup>57</sup> *Bacch.* 1193.

<sup>58</sup> *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig 1890, 48.

<sup>59</sup> *The Origins of European Thought*, Cambridge 1951, 198 and note 1.

<sup>60</sup> See Plut. *Pomp.* 2,5-8 (Flora); 2,9-10 (other men's wives); 48,7-8; 52,1 (Julia); 55,1-4 (Cornelia). For Pompey the cuckold see Plut. *Pomp.* 42,13, Suet. *Iul.* 50,1.

<sup>61</sup> See Eur. *Hipp.* 967-70, Anaxandr. fr. 61 K.-A., Men. *Sam.* 349-50, Plut. *Mor.* 751b. For the manliness of resistance to lust see Xen. *Ages.* 5,1-4, Iulius Hyginus ap. Gell. I 14,2 (fr. 3 Peter). For the unmanliness of the adulterer see Aesch. *Ag.* 1224-5, 1625-7, *Cho.* 304-5, Soph. *El.* 299-302, Sen. *Ag.* 890, Ael. *VH* XII 12.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Ar. *Nub.* 654 and schol., Pax 549 and schol. (but note *Suda* σ 606, IV 379 A., s.v. σκιμαλίσσω), Diog. Laert. VI 34 (on Diogenes and Demosthenes), Arr. *Epict.* III 2,11 (on Diogenes), D. Chr. 33,37. See also Poll. II 184 for the use of the term καταπύγων for this finger; *Suda* σ 1711, IV 484 A., s.v. σφακελισμός, for the term σφάκελος.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Mart. II 28,1-2, VI 70,5-6, *Priap.* 56,1-2, Suet. *Aug.* 45,4, Juv. 10,53, *Hist. Aug. Heliog.* 10,7 (*digitis?*). For the term *fāmosus* see Porph. *Hor. Serm.* II 8,26; for *infamis* Pers. 2,33; for *impudicus* Isid. *Etym.* XI 1,71 (Mart. VI 70,5, *Priap.* 56,1-2); for *uerpus* *Gloss. Lat.* II 206,49.

*imitari*; Hor. *Epist.* I 18,13-14 *ut puerum saeuo credas dictata magistro / reddere uel partis mimum tractare secundas*; Verg. *Aen.* VIII 691-2 *pelago credas innare reuolsas / Cycladas*; Ov. *Met.* V 193-4 *adapertaque uelle / ora loqui credas*, XI 250 *uirginis est uerae facies, quam uiuere credas*, XI 517-18 *inque fretum credas totum descendere caelum / inque plagas caeli tumefactum adscendere pontum*; Sen. *H.O.* 1730-1 *Caucasum aut Pindum aut Athon / ardere credas*; Lucan. I 493-5 *credas aut tecta nefandas / corripuisse faces aut iam quatiente ruina / nutantes pendere domos*; Pers. 3,9 *ut Arcadiae pecuaria rudere credas* (some witnesses); Mart. IV 64,29-30 *credas Alcinoi pios Penates / aut (facti modo diuitis) Molorchi*; VIII 36,5 *septenos pariter credas assurgere montes*; XI 31,12 *ut lentem positam fabamque credas*; Priap. 12,15 *ut credas Epicuron oscitari*; Juv. 3,6-9 *ut non / deterius credas horrere incendia, lapsus / tectorum adsiduos ac mille pericula saeuae / urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetas*; 14,149 *ut credas falcibus actum*; 15,117-18 *ut iam quae carmina tradunt : digna fide credas*; Apul. *Met.* VIII 25 *ut in asini corio modestum hominem inhabitare credas*<sup>64</sup>. *quo* constitutes a problem. We should have expected *ut*<sup>65</sup>. Nevertheless, although *quo* in the sense of 'because of which', 'as a result of which' seems not to occur in our record, its correlative *eo* does so occur often enough<sup>66</sup> to suggest that both were once in regular use. If emendation is required one might suggest *quor?* = *cur?*<sup>67</sup> rather than *quid?* or *quid...*?<sup>68</sup>.

If the paradosis of both Seneca and the scholia can be defended we are left with the question of what Calvus himself wrote. Two considerations must count against Seneca. Either he or his source<sup>69</sup> cited from memory, beginning in mid-verse. The author of the biographical statement drawn on by the scholia is more likely to have consulted an actual text. Secondly, *digito caput uno scalpit, quo credas hunc sibi uelle uirum* puts the shocking suggestion more strongly than *digito caput scalpit. quid? dicas hunc sibi uelle uirum?* The rhetorician was wanting to illustrate the *animus ingens* of Calvus. It could be thought that he unconsciously rewrote the statement in an apparently more pungent way. In any case the editor of the remains of Calvus has to choose between *quo credas ...* and *quid? dicas ...?* He does not need to, and should not, make up from random bits of the tradition his own epigram after the model of Martial.

Manchester

HENRY DAVID JOCELYN

<sup>64</sup> For *credere* Acc. *Trag.* 321, Liv. XXXI 7,11, Sen. *Ag.* 486-7, Petron. 31,7; 83,2, Apul. *Apol.* 75, *Met.* I 11, X 2.

<sup>65</sup> As at Hor. *Epist.* I 18,10-14 *et al.*

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Plaut. *Truc.* 84-5, Ter. *Hec.* 238, Liv. I 11,8, II 48,4.

<sup>67</sup> For the form *quor* see Plaut. *Amph.* 730 (P), *Epid.* 574 (A), *Pseud.* 318 (A).

<sup>68</sup> For *cur* following injunctions and statements see Enn. *Var.* 18, Cic. *Lig.* 17, *Phil.* II 15, XI 4, Hor. *Serm.* II 3,187; 7,104.

<sup>69</sup> For the problem see J. Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder*, Cambridge 1981, 96-103, 262.