# Cato the Censor and the Creation of a Paternal Paradigm

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by Eleanor Reeve, University College, Oxford

Word Count: 99,977

## Abstract

This thesis analyses the relationship between Marcus Porcius Cato Censorius and his eldest son, Marcus Porcius Cato Licinianus, considering its importance for Cato's public image and political career, investigating its place within some of the central cultural debates of the 2nd century BC, and looking at the impact which this relationship had upon received impressions of Cato the Censor as presented by later Latin authors. This is done primarily through the examination of the written works which Cato addressed to Licinianus, the extant fragments of which are presented here, with a translation and commentary, in the first modern edition to treat these texts as a unified project. The subsequent sections of this thesis set the works which Cato addressed to his son within the context of the general cultural debate and individual political competition which engaged Rome's ruling elite during this period; Cato's adoption of a paternal persona within these works is related to the character's popular appeal in the military sphere and on the comic stage; and the didactic pose and agricultural instruction featured in these texts is used to illuminate some of the challenges posed to Cato's successful performance of his duties as censor. A final section considers the reappropriation of Cato's relationship with his son as found in the *De officiis* of Cicero, the *Institutio oratoria* of Quintilian, and the anonymous *Disticha Catonis*. This thesis suggests that the Censor's relationship with his son, and the works which he addressed to the young man, played a more significant part in Cato's public image and political career than has hitherto been acknowledged. These texts illuminate some of the finer points of Cato's clever political strategy and they offer fresh insight into the popular culture and elite competition of the period in which he lived. The relative importance of this relationship within Cato's public life helps to explain the popularity of later images of the Censor as a paternal and educational figure and offers us a better understanding of modern conceptions of Cato.

**Acknowledgements**

I am grateful for the generous financial support of the *Arts and Humanities Research Council*, the *Old Members' Trust* of University College, Oxford, and the *Craven Fund* of the Faculty of Classics, Oxford, without which this thesis would have been impossible to realise. The work itself is indebted to the remarkable breadth of classical knowledge and depth of enthusiasm of my supervisor Matthew Leigh. This thesis would not have begun but for the wonderful teaching of my undergraduate tutors Alan Woolley, Bill Allan, Peta Fowler, and Philomen Probert, who first kindled my fascination with the Latin language and with Roman literature and culture. This project would not have been finished without the encouragement and advice of my fellow graduate students within the Classics Faculty, my friends and housemates - most particularly Seàn Williams and James Browne - during the period of my research, and my family, for whose support I am very grateful.

**Contents**

## (i) Abbreviations

The abbreviations used in the present work for classical authors and their works are those of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. eds. (2002) 3rd edition). The abbreviations used for journals and reference works are those of *L'Année Philologique* (http://www.annee-philologique.com/index.php accessed on 19/8/2015).

In addition to these, I also make use of several other abbreviations for particular authors and editions which have been found convenient, which are given below.

C. = Cugusi, P. and Sblendorio Cugusi, M. T. (2001) *Opere di Marco Porcio Catone Censore*, Turin.

Caec. = Caecilius Statius

*DC* = *Disticha Catonis*

J. = Jordan, H. (1860) *M. Catonis praeter librum de re rustica quae extant*, Leipzig.

*ELM* = Cugusi, P. (1970) *Epistolographi Latini Minores*, vol. 1, Turin.

Fortunat. = C. Chirius Fortunatianus

*FRHist*. = Cornell, T. J. (2013) *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, Oxford.

Garg. Mart. *Med*. = Gargilius Martialis, Quintus; *Medicinae ex Oleribus et Pomis*.

K. = Keil, H. (1855-80) *Grammatici Latini*, 8 vols., Leipzig.

L. = Lindsay, W. M.

Naev. = Gnaeus Naevius

Plut. *Comp*. *Arist*. *et Cat*. *Mai*. = Plutarch; *Comparison between the Lives of Aristides and Cato the Elder.*

Plut. *Comp*. *Lyc*. *et Num*. = Plutarch; *Comparison between the Lives of Lycurgus and Numa*.

Porph. *ad Hor*. *Artem P*. = Pomponius Porphyrio; on Horace's *Ars Poetica*.

Ps. Quint. *Decl. Min.* = Pseudo-Quintilian; *The Minor Declamations*.

Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Aen.* = Servius; *Commentarius in Vergilii Aeneidos Libros*.

Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg.* = Servius; *Commentarius in Vergilii Georgicon Libros*.

Sk. = Skutsch, O. (1985) *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford.

VdH = Van den Hout, M. P. J. (1954) *M. Cornelii Frontonis: Epistulae*, Leiden.

## (ii) Editions Cited

*The Twelve Tables*
Warmington, E. H. (1938) *The Remains of Old Latin*, vol. 3, Cambridge, MA.

*Aelian*
*Varia Historia*
Dilts, M. E. (1974) *Claudii Aeliani Varia Historia*, Leipzig.

*Ammianus Marcellinus*
Rolfe, J. C. (1935-9) *Ammianus Marcellinus*, 3 vols., Cambridge, MA.

*Anthimus*
*De Observatione Ciborum*
Liechtenhan, E. (1963) *Anthimi De Observatione Ciborum ad Theodoricum Regem Francorum Epistula*, Berlin.

*Appian*
*Iberians*
Viereck, P., Roos, A. G., and Mendelssohn, L. (1939) *Appiani Historia Romana*, Leipzig.

*Asconius*
Clark, A. C. (1907) *Q. Asconii Pediani Orationum Ciceronis Quinque Enarratio*, Oxford.

*Athenaeus*
*Deipnosophistae*
Kaibel, G. (1897-90) *Athenaei Naucratitae Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, 3 vols., Leipzig.

*Ps. Aurelius Victor*
Pichlmayr, F. (1911) *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber De Caesaribus: praecedunt, Origo Gentis Romanae, Liber De Viris Illustribus Urbis Romae, subsequitur Epitome De Caesaribus*, Leipzig.

*Caecilius Statius*
Ribbeck, J. K. O. (1897-8) *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, 3rd edn., 2 vols.,

Leipzig.

*Cassiodorus*
Mynors, R. A. B. (1937) *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, Oxford.

*Marcus Porcius Cato*
*De agricultura*
Dalby, A. (1998) *On farming: De agricultura*, Totnes.
*Origines*
Cornell, T. J. (2013) *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, 3 vols., Oxford.
*Speeches*
Malcovati, E. (1953) *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta Liberae Rei Publicae*, 3rd edn., Turin.
*Minor Works*
Cugusi, P. and Sblendorio Cugusi, M. T. (2001) *Opere di Marco Porcio Catone Censore*, Turin.
*Works Addressed to Licinianus*:
The edition of this thesis is used throughout.
*Disticha Catonis*
Boas, M. and Botschuyver, J. (1952) *Disticha Catonis*, Amsterdam.

*Catullus*
Mynors, R. A. B. (1958) *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Oxford.

*Charisius*
*Ars Grammatica*
Barwick, K. (1997) *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis grammaticae libri V*, 2nd edn. with additions and corrections by F. Kühnert, Stuttgart.

*Cicero*
*Speeches*
Clark, A. C. (1900-17) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*, 6 vols., Oxford.
*Letters*
Shackleton Bailey, D. R., Purser, L. C., and Watt, W. S. (1958-65) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae*, 3 vols., Oxford.
*Philosophical Works*
Wilkins, A. S. (1901-3) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetorica*, 2 vols., Oxford.
Powell, J. G. F. (2006) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Re Publica*, *De Legibus, Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*, Oxford.
Winterbottom, M. (1994) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Officiis*, Oxford.
*Paradoxa Stoicorum*
Sutton, E. W. and Rackham, H. (1967-8) *Cicero: De Oratore, together with, De Fato, Paradoxa Stoicorum, De Partitione Oratoria*, Cambridge, MA.

*Columella*
Rodgers, R. H. (2010) *L. Iuni Moderati Columellae Res Rustica*, Oxford.

*Demetrius*
Roberts, W. R. (1902) *Demetrius: on Style*, Cambridge.

*Diogenes Laertius*
Long, H. S. (1964) *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, 2 vols., Oxford.

*Diomedes Grammaticus*
Keil, H. (1855-80) *Grammatici Latini*, 8 vols., Leipzig.

*Dionysius of Halicarnassus*
*Roman Antiquities*
Jacoby, C. (1885-1925) *Dionysii Halicarnasensis Antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt*, 4 vols., Stuttgart and Leipzig.
*De Compositione Verborum*
Usener, H. and Radermacher, L. (1899-1929) *Dionysii Halicarnasensis quae exstant – Opuscula*, 2 vols., Stuttgart and Leipzig.

*Donatus*
Wessner, P. (1902-8) *Aeli Donati quod fertur Commentum Terenti: accedunt Eugraphi Commentum et Scholia Bembina*, 3 vols., Leipzig.

*Ennius*
Skutsch, O. (1985) *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford.

*Festus*
Lindsay, W. M. (1913) *Sexti Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli Epitome*, Leipzig.

*Florus*
Malcovati, E. (1972) *L. Annaei Flori quae exstant*, Rome.

*C. Chirius Fortunatianus*
Halm, K. (1863) *Rhetores Latini Minores*, Leipzig.

*Frontinus*
Ireland, R. I. (1990) *Iuli Frontini Strategemata*, Leipzig.

*Fronto*
Van den Hout, M. P. J. (1954) *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae*, Leiden.

*Gaius*
*Institutes*
Gordon, W. M. and Robinson, O. F. (1988) *The Institutes of Gaius*, Ithaca, NY.

*Galen*
Kühn, C. G. (1821-33) *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, 20 vols., Leipzig.

*Aulus Gellius*
Marshall, P. K. (1968) *A. Gellii Noctes Atticae*, reissued (with corrections) 1990, Oxford.

*Horace*
*Satires*

Gowers, E. (2012) *Horace: Satires Book One*, Cambridge.
*Epistles*
Rudd, N. (1989) *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, Cambridge.
*Odes*
Quinn, K (1980) *Horace: The Odes*, London.

*Isidorus*
*Etymologiae*
Lindemannus, F. (1833) *Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum Veterum*, 4 vols., Leipzig.

*Jerome*
*Chronicle*
Helm, R. W. O. (1956) *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, Berlin.

*Julius Victor*
Halm, C. (1863) *Rhetores Latini Minores*, Leipzig.

*Justinian*
Watson, A (1998) *The Digest of Justinian*, 4 vols., Philadelphia, PA.
Cooper, T. and Harris, G. (1841) *The Institutes of Justinian: with notes*, New York, NY.

*Justinus*
Seel, O (1972) *M. Iuniani Iustini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*, Stuttgart.

*Juvenal*
Housman, A. E. (1931) *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, Cambridge.

*Lactantius*
*Divinae Institutiones*
Heck, E. and Wlosok, A. (2005-11) *Lactantius: Divinarum Institutionum Libri Septem*, 4 vols., Berlin.

*Pseudo-Libanius*
*Epistolary Styles*
Malherbe, A. J. (1988) *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, Atlanta, GA.

*Livy*
*Ab Urbe Condita*
Walters, C. F. and Conway, R. S. (1914-99) *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita*, 6 vols., Oxford.
Briscoe, J. (1986) *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita Libri XLI-XLV*, Stuttgart.
*Periochae*
Schlesinger, A. C. (1967) *Livy: Summaries, fragments and Obsequens*, Cambridge, MA.

*Lucilius*
Marx, F. (1904-5) *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*, 2 vols., Leipzig.

*Lucretius*

Rouse, W. H. D. (1982) *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura*, 2nd edn revised by M. F. Smith, Cambridge, MA.

*Macrobius*
*Saturnalia*
Kaster, R. A. (2011) *Macrobius: Saturnalia*, 3 vols., Cambridge, MA.

*Marcellus*
Niedermann, M., Liechtenhan, E., Kollesch, J. and Nickel, D. (1968) *Marcelli De Medicamentis Liber*, 2 vols., Berlin.

*Gargilius Martialis*
*Medicinae ex Oleribus et Pomis*
Rose, V. (1875) *Plinii Secundi quae fertur una cum Gargilii Martialis Medicina*, Leipzig

*Menander*
Arnott, W. G. (1979–2000) *Menander*, 3 vols., Cambridge, MA.

*Gnaeus Naevius*
Ribbeck, J. K. O. (1897-8) *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, 3rd edn., 2 vols., Leipzig.

*Cornelius Nepos*
Winstedt, E. O. (1904) *Corneli Nepotis Vitae*, Oxford.

*Nonius Marcellus*
Lindsay, W. M. and Onions, J. H. (1903) *Nonii Marcelli De Compendiosa Doctrina*, 3 vols., Leipzig.

*Ovid*
*Tristia*
Luck, G. (1967-77) *P. Ovidius Naso: Tristia*, 2 vols., Heidelberg.

*Pausanias*
Rocha-Pereira, M. H. (1989-90) *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio*, 3 vols., Leipzig.

*Petronius*
Smith, M. S. (1975) *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis*, Oxford.

*Pindar*
Bowra, C. M. (1935) *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Oxford.

*Plautus*
de Melo, W. (2011-3) *Plautus*, 5 vols., Cambridge, MA.

*Pliny the Elder*
Beaujeu, J. (1950) *Pline L'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre I*, Paris.
Schilling, R. (2003) *Pline L'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre VII*, Paris.
Le Bonniec, H. (1972) *Pline L'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre XVIII*, Paris.

Ernout, A. (1962) *Pline L'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre XXVIII*, Paris.
Ernout, A. (1962) *Pline L'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre XXIX*, Paris.
Croisille, J. M. (1985) *Pline L'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre XXXV*, Paris.

*Pliny the Younger*
*Letters*
Mynors, R. A. B. (1963) *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum Libri Decem*, Oxford.

*Pseudo-Pliny the Younger*
*De Medicina*
Önnerfors, A. (1964) *Plinii Secundi Iunioris qui feruntur De Medicina Libri Tres*, Berlin.

*Plato*
Burnet, J. (1902-6) *Platonis Opera*, 5 vols., Oxford.

*Plutarch*
*Parallel Lives*
Ziegler, K. and Lindskog, C. (1960-73) *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, 4 vols., Leipzig.
*Moralia*
Various Editors (1927-2004) *Plutarch's Moralia*, 16 vols., Cambridge, MA.

*Polybius*
Paton, W. R. (2010-2) *Polybius: The Histories*, 6 vols., Cambridge, MA.

*Pomponius*
Ribbeck, J. K. O. (1897-8) *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, 3rd edn., 2 vols., Leipzig.

*Porphyrio*
Meyer, W. (1874) *Pomponii Porphyrionis Commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum*, Leipzig.

*Priscian*
Keil, H. (1855-80) *Grammatici Latini*, 8 vols., Leipzig

*Quintilian*
*Institutio Oratoria*
Russell, D. A. (2001) *Quintilian: The Orator's Education*, 5 vols., Cambridge, MA.

*Pseudo-Quintilian*
*Minor Declamations*
Winterbottom, M. (1984) *The Minor Declamations Ascribed to Quintilian*, Berlin.

*Sallust*
Reynolds, L. D. (1991) *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Historiarum Fragmenta Selecta, Appendix Sallustiana*, Oxford.

*Seneca the Elder*
Müller, H. J. (1887) *L. Annaei Senecae Oratorum et Rhetorum, Sententiae, Divisiones, Colores*, Vienna.

*Seneca the Younger*
Haase, F. (1852-3) *L. Annaei Senecae Opera quae supersunt*, 3 vols., Leipzig.
Reynolds, L. D. (1965) *L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, 2 vols., Oxford.

*Servius*
Thilo, G. and Hagen, H. (1878-1902) *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur In Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*, 3 vols. Leipzig.

*Solinus*
Mommsen, T. (1895) *C. Iulii Solini Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium*, Berlin.

*Strabo*
Meineke, A. (1904-9) *Strabonis Geographica*, 3 vols., Leipzig.

*Suetonius*
*Lives*
Carter, J. M. (1982) *Suetonius: Divus Augustus*, Bristol.
*De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*
Kaster, R. A. (1995) *C. Suetonius Tranquillus: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*, Oxford.

*Tacitus*
Mayer, R. (2001) *Tacitus: Dialogus de Oratoribus*, Cambridge.

*Terence*
Barsby, J. (2001) *Terence*, 2 vols., Cambridge, MA.

*Thucydides*
Jones, H. S. and Powell, J. E. (1956) *Thucydidis Historiae*, 2 vols., 2 edn., Oxford.

*Valerius Maximus*
Briscoe, J (1998) *Valeri Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, 2 vols., Stuttgart.

*Varro*
*De Lingua Latina*
Kent, R. G. (1938) *Varro: On the Latin Language*, 2 vols., Cambridge, MA.
*Logistorici*
Marcucci, S. (2001) *Cato: sull' educazione dei figli*, Parma.

*Vegetius*
Reeve, M. D. (2004) *Vegetius: Epitoma Rei Militaris*, Oxford.

*Velleius Paterculus*
Watt, W. S. (1998) *Vellei Paterculi Historiarum ad M. Vinicium Consulem libri duo*, Stuttgart.

*Vergil*
Mynors, R. A. B. (1969) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Oxford.

*Xenophon*

Marchant, E. C. (1900-20) *Xenophontis Opera Omnia, 5 vols*., Oxford.

*Zonaras*
Dindorf, L. A. (1868-75) *Ioannis Zonarae Epitome Historiarum*, 6 vols., Leipzig.

Unless otherwise specified, all translations from Greek and Latin texts are my own.

# 1 Introduction

This thesis offers an assessment of the relationship between Marcus Porcius Cato and his eldest son Marcus Porcius Cato Licinianus.[1] It uses this relationship to explore Cato's political career and his literary works, and to act as a window upon the wider cultural changes which Rome underwent during the 2nd century BC.[2] This thesis also considers the place of this relationship in the reconstructions and re-echoes of Cato found in later Roman writers.[3] The relationship between father and son set out here thus provides a productive new approach to one of Roman history's most challenging and fascinating figures.

There are a variety of sources for the relationship of Cato the Censor and his eldest son. The relationship is frequently depicted in the written works of the Censor himself; it features in several historiographical and biographical treatments of Cato; and it is widely referred to and variously reappropriated within later works of the Latin didactic tradition, particularly within works of prose didactic.[4] The present assessment begins with an edition, including a translation and commentary, of the extant fragments and testimonia from the written works which Cato the Censor addressed to his son. The focus of the discussion which follows this edition is threefold, considering Cato in his capacity as a teacher, father, and censor, and

[1] Cato Censorius had two sons, one by each of his wives. Both the elder and younger son were named Marcus Porcius Cato and they appear to have been distinguished from one another by their matronymics, Licinianus and Salonianus, respectively, from an early date. The Elder Pliny certainly states this as the standard nomenclature for the two branches of Cato Censorius' family (Plin. *HN* 7.62). Notwithstanding their differing *agnomina*, the identities of these two individuals and their descendants have been a source of confusion since antiquity. This much is evident from the errors of Plutarch's account (*Cat. Mai.* 27.7 with Sansone (1989) *ad loc.*) and from the endeavours of Gellius to clarify the matter (*NA* 13.20). This thesis will continue to make use of their matronymics to distinguish between the two individuals in order to reduce further confusion.

[2] All dates are BC unless otherwise specified.

[3] The Censor's relationship with his son proved a point of popular interest and these later reconstructions and re-echoings are many. As well as providing some of our evidence for this relationship, through the citations which they select from the Censor's writings on this subject, these works also represent something of an independent tradition which developed around new and evolving representations of the Censor and his son during the late Republic and early Empire, and which thus merits individual study.

[4] See below *passim*.

examining the significance of his son for each of these different elements of his public persona. Subsequent analysis examines the place of Cato's paternal relationship with Licinianus in later didactic works, and particularly Cicero, Quintilian, and the anonymous *Disticha Catonis*.

In this thesis, I suggest that the relationship of the Censor to his son was of far greater importance to Cato's political career than has previously been accounted for, enhancing his popular appeal and his connection to patrician tradition; that these texts offer a valuable insight into contemporary cultural debate, particularly in the sphere of education; and that the works which were addressed to Licinianus play a significant part in developments in Latin literature during this period. The significance of the Censor's relationship with his son is attested in the subsequent popularity of Cato as a paternal figure and in his pre-eminence within later didactic works written in Latin prose, particularly those offering instruction in oratory, philosophy, and public life. Analysis of the paternal dynamic of these texts both enhances our understanding of the relationship between father and son and offers a useful example of one aspect of the evolution and development of received impressions of Cato. It is hoped that this thesis will offer a novel and illuminating approach to Cato the Censor, a fresh insight into the age in which he lived, and a useful paradigm demonstrating some of the effects of the re-echoing and reconstruction of one of the Republic's most legendary figures across subsequent ages.

**The Background**

Cato the Censor is one of the most significant political and cultural figures to emerge from Rome during the 2nd century BC.[5] A successful military commander and consummate orator, Cato rose from a relatively humble origin – his family were established equestrians from a small town just outside Rome – through the ranks of the *cursus honorum* to become consul (195) and censor (184), the highest military and civic accolades of the Republic. His political ascendency coincided with Rome's most rapid period of military expansion to date.[6] The financial enrichment and cultural change concomitant upon these conquests felt by the city in the late 3rd and first half of the 2nd century BC were also unprecedented in their degree. Cato was at the centre of several of these successful military engagements, was an active participant in senatorial debate over political and cultural policy during this period, and was at the forefront of the literary and artistic experimentation of the age. Cato's participation in public life was shaped by his plebeian status, as he fought patrician and popular prejudice to establish a distinct position for himself and his descendants amidst an upper class who were rapidly emerging as the leaders of the Roman empire. Cato's written works thus offer valuable evidence for the evolving competitive nature, changing culture, and increasing wealth of the Roman nobility in particular, as well as the altered cultural and social dynamics of the city of Rome more generally. The works which Cato addressed to his son are particularly illuminating for this period: finding their origin in Licinianus' instruction, these texts are at the forefront of contemporary developments in education, they face full-on the issues of inter-generational tension caused by the pace of current changes in the city, and their teachings – which represent important truths to be passed on to the next generation - are indicative of the values Cato felt to be, or wished to present as traditional. It is hoped, then, that this study of the texts will contribute to our understanding of the political classes in

[5] For an extensive bibliography on the Censor, see Cornell (2013) 191-2, and further, Suerbaum (2004); most helpful for this thesis have been the biographical works of Kienast (1954); Della Corte (1969); and Astin (1978).
[6] Scholars have noted the significance of this period within Roman history from Polybius onwards (Polyb. 1.1.5-6).

general, and the plight of the plebeians in particular, amidst the rapid upheaval at Rome during the 2nd century BC.

However, Cato had a significance well beyond the span of his life, quickly coming to be idealised by later Roman writers. Much of the Censor's rhetoric, particularly his appeals - in the face of Rome's rapid expansion - to traditional values and simpler times, came to be broadly associated with Roman identity and republican ideals as early as the 1st century BC, with Cato himself becoming the model of the morally upright citizen.[7] The works which the Censor addressed to his son have played an important part in this investment in Cato: these reinvocations of the Censor are often of a paternal and didactic nature and frequently recall the teachings – which are amongst Cato's clearest ideological statements - of these works.[8] The scope of this thesis, then, has importance beyond the 2nd century BC. Its analysis of the works which Cato wrote for Licinianus and its discussion of several later depictions of the Censor's relationship with his son offer insight into the political and cultural concerns of the late Republic, early Empire, and even into the early modern period, illuminating the ways in which Cato's image developed.

The work of this thesis promotes our understanding both of Cato's own life and times and, in its consideration of later uses of his image, of the concerns of later ages and their contribution to our modern impression of the Censor. This careful separation of Cato's historical person from the images of him transmitted by our sources is certainly not clear-cut: with no direct tradition for the majority of his works, each citation preserved here is selected by our sources with a preconceived idea of Cato clearly in mind. Nonetheless, it is in its attempts to separate

[7] Livy, for example, is able to create a lengthy, moralistic tirade for Cato, speaking against the reppeal of the *lex Oppia* (Livy 34.2-4 with Lefkowitz and Fant (1982) 142-7); on the idealisation of Cato, see Vogt-Spira (2000) 107-9.
[8] See below p.206-53.

the man Cato from the myth Cato that this thesis is particularly significant.[9] Recent research has highlighted problems in reconciling various pieces of historical evidence with received impressions of Cato found in later Latin sources, and, indeed, in much modern scholarship.[10] Further problems have been created by the work of archaeologists and ancient historians seeking to highlight a longstanding history of cultural interaction across the ancient Mediterranean and to reject the narrative of a largely un-Hellenised Rome prior to the 3rd century BC.[11] These findings highlight the difficulty of reading Cato as a figure who genuinely embodied traditional Roman values and was a full expression of Rome's early cultural purity. Indeed, these findings invite us to see many of Cato's claims simply as rhetoric, created by Cato with a particular pragmatic purpose and crafted further by later readers in accordance with the ideas of their own age. This thesis thus makes use of the ideas and some of the vocabulary of reception studies in order to disentangle the man from the myth, combining this approach with new research into the fragments of Cato's works and into the culture and character of the ancient Mediterranean, in pursuit of a more accurate picture of Cato the Censor than is often found in modern scholarship. In so doing, this thesis offers a paradigm for the evolution and development of a particular element of Cato's character under later readers and writers of Latin which, it is hoped, will be profitable for our understanding of other similarly legendary figures from ancient history.

**The Structure**

[9] This attempt follows those of Della Corte's *Catone Censore: la vita e la fortuna* (Florence, 1969); Ruebel's *The political development of Cato Censorius: Man and Image* (Diss. University of Cincinnati, 1972); Ceaicovschi's *(Re)constructing Cato Maior: a literary assessment of the reception of Cato the Elder in the works of Cicero, Livy, and Aulus Gellius* (Diss. University of Washington, 2008); and Wulfram's *Ex uno plures: drei Studien zum postumen Persönlichkeitsbild des Alten Cato* (Berlin, 2009). It is the first treatment of this kind to focus on tracing a particular aspect of Cato's life within his later reception, rather than focussing upon specific later authors, or endeavouring to take in all later references to Cato. It is hoped that this specificity will provide a fruitful new approach to the subject.

[10] See, especially, Gruen (1992) 52-83.

[11] See, most recently, Prag and Quinn (2013) 1-13 and the ample bibliography given there.

This thesis is divided into three distinct sections. The first section is composed of an edition of all of the texts which have been associated with Cato's authorship and with an address to his son. Following an introduction, which gives an overview of these texts and some of the difficulties in working with them, the extant fragments of and key testimonia to the texts are presented with a translation and commentary. The aim of this edition is to produce as clear a picture as possible of the works which Cato addressed to Licinianus, both collectively as a group of texts, and as individual literary products. The translation of the fragments is thus very literal and the commentary focuses primarily on the presentation of the quotation by its citing source. The final fragment of each work is followed by a short discussion of its form and content, date, and the circumstances of its publication. This discussion also considers something of the textual tradition of these fragments, charting how they have been read, edited, and transmitted by their sources: this discussion lays the foundation for several of the later readings of Cato's works discussed in the third section of this thesis. More detailed analysis of the fragments in their original context is left until the second section of the thesis.

The second section looks at the role played by the Censor's relationship with his son in his public career. The discussion here takes in three different elements, considering Cato as a teacher, father, and censor. Cato's didactic efforts with Licinianus are set within the context of contemporary debate over different educational developments and elite competition in this sphere. Cato's promotion of his fatherhood is considered in parallel with the popular appeal of paternal figures, particularly upon the comic stage and in the theatre of the military assembly, connecting Cato's use of the image to his bids for the support of the plebs. The instruction which Cato leaves for Licinianus in these works, founded on traditional agricultural topics, approached with an attitude of hard work and frugality, is interwoven with the language and imagery of Cato's censorial speeches, strengthening his connection with the

patrician origins of the office and confirming his authority in this prestigious role. This section highlights, then, something of the careful political strategy and artful self-presentation which can be seen in Cato's circulation of the works which he addressed to Licinianus. This, in turn, offers valuable insight into the contemporary political and cultural climate.

A third section of the thesis examines some of the different representations of Cato the Censor and of his relationship with his son in later works of Latin didactic. The prominence of the impression of Cato in this guise strongly suggests that it held an important place in the Censor's own rhetoric and that it was a point of particular appeal for later writers. Cato's instruction of Licinianus is regularly referred to, both explicitly and implicitly, by Latin prose authors of technical didactic texts, many of which also feature a filial addressee. This section focuses primarily on several of the late philosophical works of Cicero, Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, and the anonymous *Disticha Catonis*, all works in which Cato's educational vision takes on particular importance. All three authors addressed, or attempted to address, works to their sons in order to prepare them for a public career, making use of the figure of Cato as a model for writing in this way. They also employ Cato's example more widely in order to add authority to their advice, gaining a prestigious precedent for their novel, philosophical teachings. This section thus offers an insight into the developing impression of Cato the Censor in the late Republic and early Empire, with the *Disticha Catonis*, in particular, providing an important link to the enduring image of Cato as the educator of all Europe which became popular during the early modern period.

**The Present State of Research**

This treatment of the relationship between Marcus Porcius Cato, father and son, makes a significant contribution to the present state of research. The edition of the extant fragments

which have been associated with Cato the Censor as their author and with his son as their addressee, presented in the first section of this thesis, is the first of its kind. While these fragments have featured in previous editions of Cato's works, they have not yet been edited as a group of interconnected and cohesive texts, nor set fully within the context of the relationship between author and addressee, nor yet – in most cases - translated into English.[12] The work of this edition will fall in the shadow of *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, and owe much of its methodology to the vital discussions of fragmentary texts found there. It is hoped that this thesis will add a footnote to that work, offering an examination of a group of texts which very much fall on the fringe of, and act as forerunners to, Roman Historiography.[13]

This study will also contribute to our understanding of Roman political culture during the 2nd century BC. Building upon recent research into Rome's role within the ancient Mediterranean, this thesis sets aside the narrative of the city's radical Hellenisation during the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC, seeing the city's changes as ones of degree, rather than of kind.[14] Consequently, the idea of Cato as an ardent anti-Hellenist and an opponent to contemporary elite interests in Greek culture is rejected in favour of the view of Cato as just as familiar with Greek language and arts as his peers. Instead, this study seeks more immediate, pragmatic and political motivations for Cato's rhetoric, highlighting the personal struggles and private antagonism between Cato and other individuals of his peer group as behind many of his most profoundly anti-Hellenic statements. This rejection of party politics in favour of individual negotiations follows well-established scholarly perspective.[15] More

[12] On the previous editions of Cato used within this thesis, see below p.44-5. On the trend in modern scholarship for specialised editions of particular texts, such as this one, see Cornell (2013) 6.
[13] Cornell (2013).
[14] See bibliography given above at p.5 n.11.
[15] On the dismissal of the theory of the Scipionic Circle, see the ample bibliography given at Gruen (1992) 224-6.

recent research has done much to inform this investigation into Cato's pragmatic concerns for political survival: studies upon the political climate and the formation of the *nobilitas* during this period have paved the way for this thesis;[16] as has recent work on the idea of *novitas* and the rhetoric of the political newcomer.[17] The notion of self-fashioning has also been usefully applied to Cato's strategy for self-presentation and strategic self-promotion here;[18] and while the idea of Roman villa agriculture as an act of display has already been established,[19] here I have further connected these ideas with the censorship and particularly with the *lustratio*.[20] The intensity of political competition emphasised here confirms the findings of recent studies into the development of the *cursus honorum*.[21] The role of education within contemporary competition, explored in the second section of this thesis, builds upon the research of Morgan, in particular, but also of Marrou, Bonner, Cribiore, Bloomer, Bernstein into the patterns of Hellenistic education and its role as a catalyst in the construction and reconstruction of Roman education that took place during this period and beyond.[22] For this aspect of this thesis recent work on the reconstruction of Roman history during the 2nd century BC, and into the reconstruction of tradition more generally, has been essential.[23]

The beginnings of Latin literature has been a subject of significant scholarly interest over recent years. The work of Denis Feeney has led the way in this area, but important contributions to our understanding of early Latin epic have also been made by Goldberg, Rüpke, Leigh, and others.[24] This thesis offers an extension of these studies, making

[16] See especially Hölkeskamp (1993), (2004); Rosenstein (1993); Bleckmann (2002); Pittinger (2008); Flower (2009a).
[17] Van der Blom (2010).
[18] Developed initially in Greenblatt (1980); but in the classical tradition now, see Dugan (2005).
[19] Purcell (1995); Sciarrino (2011); Reay (2005), (2012).
[20] The study of Suolahti (1963) has been essential for this work; however, a fruitful avenue for further research may be further investigation into the imagery surrounding the Roman censorship.
[21] Brennan (2000).
[22] Morgan (1998); Marrou (1956); Bonner (1977); Cribiore (2001); Bloomer (2011); Bernstein (2008).
[23] On Roman history: Gildenhard (2003); on tradition: Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983).
[24] Feeney (2005); Goldberg (1995), (2005); Rüpke (2006); Leigh (2010).

consideration of Rome's first steps in prose composition and looking at the aims and processes behind these. In this, Sciarrino's study *Cato the Censor and the Beginnings of Latin Prose*, with its discussion of Cato's exploitation of prose as a strongly oral and an agentive form of text, has been hugely informative.[25] This thesis has also sought to integrate Cato's works into discussions of contemporary comedy and the rhetoric of the theatre, most notably that of Leigh.[26] Recent work on Roman autobiography has helped the work of this thesis in reading Cato's texts, and considering their possible circulation and publication, alongside other military and political documents circulated during this period.[27]

This investigation into the presentation of Cato and Licinianus' relationship within the works of Cicero, Quintilian, and in the *Disticha Catonis* builds, most prominently, upon the increasing interest in reception studies felt across the discipline.[28] This section of the thesis is also indebted to the large body of scholarship that has been produced on Latin didactic and, particularly, upon epistolary treatises in recent years.[29] In particular, the finding that Cato appears to have held a special place within Cicero and Quintilian's negotiations of their didactic role and philosophical subject matter, builds upon recent studies of Cicero's philosophy, and upon contemporary interest in Quintilian.[30] Furthermore, considering these authors' reflections on Cato allows this study to further the work of Hinds upon the Romans', and particularly Cicero's, construction of their literary history; Cicero highlights Cato as the father of Roman philosophy, placing him at the head of a canon which culminates in Cicero

[25] Sciarrino (2011).
[26] Leigh (2004a).
[27] Lewis (1991), (1993); Cornell (2009).
[28] For an excellent starting point for the idea, see the entry of Don and Peta Fowler s.v. *literary theory*, cols. 2-3, *OCD* (3rd edn., 2002).
[29] The work of Volk (2002) has offered a particularly productive definition of the didactic genre with which to think here; on the epistolary treatise, Trapp (2003); Morello and Morrison (2007) and LeMoine (1991) have been invaluable.
[30] On Cicero: Gildenhard (2007); on Quintilian: Russell (2001); Reinhardt and Winterbottom (2006).

himself.[31] The exploration of Cato's role within the *Disticha Catonis* offers further insight into the philosophical reimaginings of Cato - in this it is contrary to Connolly's recent series of articles – and suggests something of the way in which the Censor came to be remembered as Rome's wisest man.[32] The popularity of Cato's relationship with his son in the imagination of the Roman public also points to its historical significance for Cato himself – this section of the thesis thus returning us to its beginning once more.

**A Final Word**

This thesis is a diverse and distinctive product. It approaches the works which Cato the Censor wrote for his son from philological, literary, and historical perspectives, making extensive effort to set these texts in their context and using them to explore the political, literary, and cultural climate of the 2nd century BC. It takes in the transmission and reception of these works, looking at texts which span a 300 year period, produced by authors writing under vastly different regimes and in very different circumstances. This investigation allows us to outline the importance of these works not only within their own age, but also to trace their development as a textual corpus over following generations, and even to examine their influence and impact upon later writers. The clearly delineated focus of the diverse threads of this thesis - the relationship between Marcus Porcius Cato and his son and the works which represented it - maintains the study's coherence, allowing it to paint this fascinating picture of a single subject across diverse authors, audiences, and ages. It is hoped that this novel, thematic approach to a familiar figure will be both useful and insightful.

[31] Hinds (1998).
[32] Connolly (2012), (2013).

## 2 The Edition

The first section of this thesis is an edition of the extant fragments of and testimonia to the works which have been associated with the authorship of Cato the Censor and with an address to his son.[1] This edition comprises a diverse body of around thirty citations, which are variegated indeed; some fragments are just a few words long, while others are more substantial passages; some are prose, and some verse; some directly address Cato's son, while others are simply aimed at his readership.[2] The citing sources differ widely, too, in their date, genre, and in their style and purpose of citation.[3] The inclusion of testimonia to these works alongside the fragments has been helpful in constructing an impression of the individual texts.[4] The inclusion of such testimonia, as well as being invaluable in this respect, also follows the precedent offered by the recent edition of the *FRHist*., after that offered by the *HRR* and, in turn, after Jordan's 1860 edition of Cato's works.[5] This edition does not include any further distinctions of fragment type, setting aside the common terms, *incerta*, *dubia*, and *falsa*. While these are familiar categories, regularly employed in other editions of

[1] I am indebted to Ed Bispham for suggesting this idea as part of his valuable feedback on my transfer of status paper.
[2] I adopt the familiar term 'fragment' to refer to these citations throughout, though the merits of the term *reliquia*, helpfully discussed at Cornell (2013) 3 n.1, would make a more accurate, if less commonplace, alternative.
[3] See below p.40-4.
[4] For the purposes of this edition, I consider a fragment to be part of a word, a word, or words deemed to have originated from the texts in question which are preserved (a) in a direct quotation (b) in a paraphrase (c) in an attempt to estimate the content of a specific short passage from a relevant text. I term a testimonium to be a mention, a description, or an estimation of an extended passage, section, or the entirety of a relevant text. The emphasis of the distinction is thus on a verbal-level, as opposed to a non-verbal level of interest in the work discussed by the citing source. However, it must be recognised that this level of interest is a question of degree, rather than a dichotomy; in some cases there will thus be the possibility of debate over exactly how a citation is termed and treated. It is hoped that the distinctions made here, when viewed relatively, will help, rather than hinder, the analysis and interpretation of the citations collected.
[5] Cornell (2013) 7. Indeed, there is a certain circularity in the patterns of influence which have shaped this edition.

collected fragments, and even in editions of the works of Cato,[6] they were not felt to be especially helpful within this particular edition: the uncertainty of the form, content, and authenticity of many of the fragments included here could lead to an excessive - and hence unprofitable – use of these terms. Instead, this edition takes a cautiously inclusive attitude to the fragments associated both with Cato's authorship and with an address to his son. Any notable exclusions are discussed within the commentary. With such distinctions thus put to one side, this edition gathers the fragments and testimonia here into individual works, and structures these – as far as is possible – in chronological order. I begin by setting out the fragments of each work, following these with a broader discussion of its form and content, as well as the date and circumstances of its publication, after the final fragment associated with it.[7] It is hoped that this structure will facilitate a clear focus throughout upon the texts themselves. The fragments are presented with a translation into English, which, in the interests of clarity, I have kept as literal and accurate as possible. Each fragment is also accompanied by a brief commentary; the comment given here is primarily concerned with setting the fragments and testimonia in the immediate context of their citing source and with the interpretation of the details provided by that source. The comment offered here doesn't, however, extend to a full account of each citing source, although many of these are discussed later on in the thesis, and special attention is paid throughout to Plutarch, whose evidence is particularly important for matters of Cato's family life. Further analysis of the fragments is left to later sections of this thesis.

[6] Malcovati (1953) uses the category *incertae sedis reliquiae* within her fragments of Roman oratory; Jordan (1860) distinguishes groups of fragments from within those he associates with Cato and his son as *incertorum librorum reliquiae* and *dubiae auctoritatis*; Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001) use *operis pars incerta, incertorum librorum fragmenta, fragmenta incertum an Catonis*, and *falsa*, to distinguish different subsets within the group of fragments which they associate with Cato and Licinianus.

[7] The question of the publication of Cato's works in general, and of the works which he wrote to his son in particular, within his lifetime is hotly debated. See below, p.20-8.

The scope of this edition is limited in a number of ways. Some of these limitations have arisen from the nature of the subject matter, others are an integral part of the wider purposes of this thesis, while others I have imposed for the sake of maintaining a manageable project. The first major limitation is the small number of citations included within this edition. In part, this is a result of the relatively small number of authors who quote from works which were directly associated with the authorship of the Censor and with an address to his son. However, the possible number of citations which could have legitimately, albeit loosely, been termed as 'associated with' the Censor and his son is, in fact, far larger than the number included here: this edition does not include all of the comments made by Cato regarding educational matters - many of which were likely to have been aimed at Licinianus, although none of which mention him by name; nor does it take in the other didactic works written by Cato which can be associated with the youth; nor does it include the *Disticha Catonis*, a work which claimed to be written by Cato for his son.[8] Furthermore, I have decided not to include all of the allusions in later authors to the relationship between Cato and Licinianus within the edition, though these, too, are associated with Cato's address to Licinianus.[9] Likewise, testimonia included here have been restricted to those most relevant to the individual works and to the relationship they depict. These limitations have helped to keep a clear and delineated corpus of citations, which is focussed upon those that are the most pertinent to the relationship between Cato and Licinianus, and thus most helpful for the discussion in the later sections of this thesis.

[8] For the details of the works included, see below p.37-8.
[9] The most influential of these allusions are discussed in the later sections of this thesis; however, the allusions to and descriptions of the relationship between Cato and Licinianus are many, and while those treated here are certainly among the most significant, they make no claims to be an exhaustive list.

The small number of citations which make up this edition limit its scope significantly in terms of discussing questions of genre, register, and style in relation to these works.[10] There is simply not enough material to draw any firm conclusions about their exact form, the language in which they were written, a notion of their genre, or their register in relation to Cato's wider works. While some fragments do prompt speculation about the register which Cato might have aimed at within the works he addresses to his son, such speculation is limited, and the discussion which follows this edition is thus of a broader cultural and historical nature than we might otherwise expect from such a specialised edition.

The edition is further restricted in the absence of an apparatus criticus. Instead, the editions of the citing sources used – all of which include their own apparatuses - are listed at (ii) and the places where I have chosen a particular reading are highlighted within the commentary. Nor does the edition include a bibliography attached to each citation. These features of full editions were both felt to be cumbersome additions to the collection of citations presented here.

In short, this edition is a companion piece, neither conceived of, nor written as a stand-alone product. Instead, the edition is a preliminary, introducing the relationship that is central to this thesis with its most significant body of textual evidence, and acting as a basis for subsequent discussion.[11] While these slight and often highly fragmentary citations would be difficult to conceive of as a separate and specific edition, in the context of the purposes of this thesis, they form a uniquely informative textual tool for unlocking an aspect of Cato's life, a

[10] Such discussions of Cato's works are always limited in this manner, but it is particularly the case here.
[11] While this evidence and the discussion which it supports is supplemented throughout by a range of other historiographical and biographical sources, it is, nonetheless, these works – written by Cato for Licinianus - which naturally remain predominant in the interpretation of the relationship offered here.

window onto his times, and a thread of his reception which has, as yet, received little scholarly attention. While many of these fragments feature in other editions of Cato's works, or in collections of fragmentary works by genre,[12] this edition is unique in its thematic approach to the material available - bringing together all of the works which form part of the Censor's relationship with his son into a single, specialised collection for the first time.[13] This new presentation of the fragments allows a fresh look at the evidence they provide. It is hoped that this edition will act as a vital interpretative tool for the relationship between Cato the Censor and his son and, along with the discussion which develops from it, will demonstrate the importance of the relationship for our understanding of Cato's life, times, and later reception.

Before we come to the edition itself there are several preliminary issues relating to the texts and to their addressee which warrant discussion. The first of these is the life of Marcus Porcius Cato Licinianus – the Censor's eldest son. The biography of Licinianus, set out below (2.1), provides the immediate context (or certainly the claimed context) for many of the works which feature in this edition. This account of his life, then, helps to make sense of the texts which his father wrote for him, contributing to our understanding of when and with what purpose they were written. The second subject for discussion is the question of the publication of these works. Critics have been cautious about the possibility of Cato himself circulating his written works, and this section (2.2) sets out the main perspectives on the debate. The third subject treated here is an overview of the individual works which have been associated with Cato's authorship and with an address to his son, (2.3). While each work is

[12] As the references given in the edition below clearly show.
[13] This trend for specialised editions has been noted above p.8 n.12. This thesis is a further stage in that trend – narrowing to a particular theme (rather than a particular work) of a single author. The narrowing of the edition comes with its own risks, but it also offers greater scope for in-depth analysis of the texts which is both synchronic and diachronic in emphasis.

discussed individually within the edition itself, these works are neither clearly defined as a corpus, nor readily distinguishable from one another; as such, a general outline separating these works from one another and from the other texts connected with Cato and with Licinianus is necessary at this point in order to facilitate a first reading of these texts. This overview also begins to consider the nature and origins of the confusion that exists over the works, a subject to which the latter stages of this thesis return. A third subject for discussion is provided by the selection of the fragments, set out below at (2.4). This gives a brief overview of the different sources which cite the fragments within this edition and of the manner of their citation – giving selected statistics for the corpus of citations as a whole. This information is presented in detail as part of the commentary on each fragment; however, it is beneficial to have a basic impression of how and by whom these texts, and the relationship that they represent, were preserved before approaching the individual works.[14] This section is followed by a note on previous editions, which discusses the relationship of these to the present edition (2.5). What then follows are the fragments themselves, beginning with the *Historia* at (2.5.1).

## 2.1 Biography of Licinianus

Marcus Porcius Cato Licinianus was born to Cato's first wife, Licinia, in 192, when Cato was around forty two years of age.[15] His mother, described by Plutarch as of noble birth rather than rich (*γυναῖκα μὲν γὰρ εὐγενεστέραν ἢ πλουσιωτέραν*), seems to have come from a distinguished family and the match must have strengthened Cato's connections with the

[14] On the importance of proper analysis of the relevant citing sources, see Brunt (1980).
[15] On the life of Licinianus, see *RE* s.v. *Porcius* no. 9 cols. 143-4., no. 14, cols. 167-8; *Brill's New Pauly* s.v. *Porcius* no. 9 cols. 634-5. On the date of Licinianus' birth, see Leo (1913) 268. On the date of Cato's birth, see Astin (1978) 1 n.1.

aristocracy.[16] Licinianus was the only child to be born to Cato's first wife.[17] Rather unusually for a Roman father, Cato would have been present for much of the boy's childhood;[18] having married relatively late, Cato had already completed extensive military service both in Italy and overseas by the time of his son's birth, and was thus based in Rome during most of Licinianus' boyhood and adolescence.[19] It was perhaps this time together which allowed Cato and Licinianus to develop such a particular bond. In fact, both parents seem to have been heavily involved in the boy's upbringing. Plutarch describes how Licinia nursed the child herself (*αὐτὴ γὰρ ἔτρεφεν ἰδίῳ γάλακτι*);[20] and how Cato was present when his wife bathed and swaddled the baby (*παρεῖναι τῇ γυναικὶ λουούσῃ καὶ σπαργανούσῃ τὸ βρέφος*);[21] and oversaw all aspects of the boy's education, teaching him grammar, law, and athletics (*ἀλλ' αὐτὸς μὲν ἦν γραμματιστής, αὐτὸς δὲ νομοδιδάκτης, αὐτὸς δὲ γυμναστής*);[22] and even using resources – in this instance a history - which he had created himself for his son's instruction (*τὰς ἱστορίας δὲ συγγράψαι φησὶν αὐτὸς ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ καὶ μεγάλοις γράμμασιν*).[23] Plutarch also recounts some of the ongoing guidance and advice which Cato gave to Licinianus as a young man, urging him to invest wisely (*προτρέπων δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ἐπὶ ταῦτα, φησὶν οὐκ ἀνδρός, ἀλλὰ*

[16] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.2. The Licinii were 'probably the most important Roman plebeian family' (*Brill's New Pauly* s.v. Licinius cols. 519-20). It is tempting, though ultimately unprovable, to connect Licinia with the Licinii Crassi, a branch of the family whose rise in prominence began in the late 3rd century BC with P. L. Crassus Dives reaching the censorship in 209 and consulship in 205; a family of such standing would well fit Plutarch's description and could most plausibly be the source of an excellent match for Cato.

[17] Or, more accurately, he is the only child that we know Licinia to have borne. On the confusion between Licinianus and his half-brother, Salonianus (who was born to Cato's second wife in his old age), see above p.1 n.1.

[18] See Rawson (2003) 222-3, 226-7, 249-50.

[19] Some scholars have speculated, on the basis of his advanced age, that this wasn't Cato's first marriage (Kienast (1954) 47-8); however, it seems unlikely that an earlier marriage would go completely unmentioned by our sources.

[20] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.5. Maternal nursing, while clearly approved by Plutarch (*Mor*. 495D-496A, 609E), was an unusual choice in a society in which wet-nursing was well-established and widespread at all levels (Rawson (1986) 201-229). Cato's decision for Licinia to breastfeed her own child may have been motivated by reasons of economy, although these are not the ones which Plutarch chooses to emphasise (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.5 with Sansone (1989) *ad loc*.).

[21] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.4.

[22] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.6.

[23] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.7.

*χήρας γυναικὸς εἶναι τὸ μειῶσαί τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων*).[24] His parents' efforts were not unrewarded, and Plutarch tells us that his father found his son's 'enthusiasm faultless and his spirit answering to the best of his physical abilities' (*ἐπεὶ τὰ τῆς προθυμίας ἦν ἄμεμπτα καὶ δι' εὐφυίαν ὑπήκουεν ἡ ψυχή*).[25] Licinianus' rather delicate constitution may have predisposed him towards a career in civil, rather than in military service;[26] he seems to have spent most of his adult life working in Rome's law courts and he wrote extensively on legal matters.[27] However, we know that Licinianus also undertook a spell of military service during the Third Macedonian War. Licinianus showed great enthusiasm for his military activities, even wishing to remain on campaign after the disbanding of his legion.[28] He distinguished himself during the final campaign of the war, whilst serving as a legate under L. Aemilius Paullus. During the Battle of Pydna, in 168, Licinianus made a daring attempt to recover his sword, lost in earlier fighting.[29] Licinianus might have been involved in other military campaigns, but nothing can be said of these with any certainty. Following on from his military successes under Aemilius, Licinianus married his commander's daughter, Tertia, sometime before 161.[30] The young couple were said to have been disturbed by the Elder Cato's amorous activities in old age and Licinianus, in particular, was displeased at his father's remarriage after the death of his mother.[31] Licinianus seems to have resented the youth and social status

[24] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 21.8. On the value of Plutarch's account as evidence for Licinianus and his relationship with his father, see below p.257-62.
[25] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.9.
[26] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.9.
[27] Sources state that both Cato Censorius and Licinianus wrote on legal subjects, with Licinianus' works being the more numerous and an important source for later legal writers (Pomponius *Dig*. 1.2.2.38). One of Licinianus' works was at least fifteen books in length (Paulus *Dig*. 45.1.4.1), and one contained details of the legal counsel offered to clients in particular cases (Cic. *De or*. 2.142). The works were still influential under the empire (Ulp. *Dig*. 21.1.10.1; *Inst. Iust*. 1.11.12; Amm. Marcell. 26.10.10). The *regula Catoniana*, which treated the validity of an inheritance, is likely to have been the work of Licinianus (*Dig*. 34.7).
[28] Cic. *Off*. 1.37; for further discussion on this fragment, see below on F22.
[29] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.10-1; Plut. *Aem*. 21; Just. *Epit*. 33.2; Frontin. *Str*. 4.5.17; Val. Max. 3.2.16; see below on F26.
[30] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.12, 24.2, *Aem*. 5.6, 21.1; Cic. *Sen*. 15, *Verr*. 2.4.22; Vell. Pat. 2.8.1. On the marriage as a mark of Cato's close ties with the aristocracy, see Astin (1978) 104. On the supposed political and cultural differences between the two families, see below p.179 n.123.
[31] Sources suggest that Licinia passed away during her son's youth, seemingly around the time of his marriage to Tertia (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 24.1-2; Gell. *NA* 13.20.8).

of Cato's second wife (she was the daughter of one of his freedmen, Salonius, who had formerly been one of Cato's under secretaries), as well as the imposition of a step-mother so late in his own life.[32] We know little else of Licinianus' life beyond these details. Licinianus' death is recorded as occurring in 152, when he was praetor designate.[33] He left two surviving sons, Marcus Porcius Cato (*cos*. 118) and Gaius Porcius Cato (*cos*. 114).[34] Licinianus' father is said to have borne the loss of his son with forbearance and restraint.[35]

## 2.2 The Question of Publication

That Cato's written works, including those addressed to his son, were widely read, cited, and edited in the years after his death is certain. It is much more difficult, however, to make any claims about when these works came to be circulated or by whom they were made available for public consultation. Scholarly opinion on the question of the publication of Cato's works is generally, but not unanimously, cautious about the possibility of Cato circulating these texts within his own lifetime.[36] Notwithstanding this, I believe that there is significant evidence that the Censor did, in fact, make the existence of the works addressed to his son public knowledge and made the texts themselves available to his friends and peers.

[32] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 24.1-8.
[33] Cic. *Tusc*. 3.70; Gell. *NA* 13.20.9. Several other sources date Licinianus' death to the year of his praetorship (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 24.9; Livy, *Per*. 48), but the testimony of Cicero and Gellius is likely to be the more reliable.
[34] Cato's most famous descendant, Cato the Younger (Uticensis) was the grandson of Salonianus, the son born to Cato by his second wife, Salonia, in his advanced old age (Plin *HN* 7.61-2, Solin. 1.59, [Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill*. 47.9.). On the confusion over the identities of Licinianus and Salonianus, see above p.1 n.1. This confusion appears to have extended to their descendants to the point that Gellius holds it to be a display of erudition par excellence for his teacher, the grammarian C. Sulpicius Apollinaris, to be able to give an account of Cato's family tree, see Gell. *NA* 13.20 with Holford-Strevens (2003) 84.
[35] Cicero frequently recalls Cato's forbearance in the face of the loss of his son; he does so *in propria persona* at *Fam*. 4.6.1, he also mentions it in dialogue at *Tusc*. 3.70, and Cicero has Laelius remark on it at *Amic*. 9. Cicero has his character Cato recollect his son's virtue with fondness at *Sen*. 15, 68, 84. Plutarch, likely to be following Cicero, also mentions Cato's philosophical attitude to his loss (*Cat. Mai*. 24.10). For further discussion of Cato's stiff upper lip in the face of his grief and its philosophical implications, see below p.220-1.
[36] While most scholars are happy to admit Cato's circulation of his practically oriented works, such as the *De agricultura*, far fewer see his more polished productions, such as the speeches and the *Origines* as circulated by his own hand; see below p.23-4.

Moreover, I find, in the life of Licinianus, a plausible context for these works and a positive source for suggesting dates for their circulation. The possibility that Cato himself circulated these works introduces a tantalising and fascinating relationship between the texts' intended audience and their declared addressee. This relationship informs the discussion of this thesis. While the claims made here, in large part, do not rely upon the existence of this relationship, or indeed, on Cato's circulation of the works which he addressed to his son, the way in which these works came to light is nevertheless an important question – and one which has received much critical attention – and it thus merits discussion here. In particular, it is worth considering what is meant by the term 'publication' both at this very early stage in Latin literature, as well as within the context of an elite culture which did not value a decisive distinction between public and private. Indeed, it is largely as a part of these considerations that I have become increasingly convinced of the likelihood that Cato himself saw to the circulation of these texts.

As has been noted above, the life of Licinianus provides both a clear practical purpose for the works which Cato addressed to him and a credible timescale for their circulation.[37] Several of the texts make reference to a particular point within his development: the *Historia* is presented as an aid for the boy in learning to read;[38] the *Epistulae* praise and advise Licinianus in his military endeavours;[39] and the *Liber ad filium* has the hallmarks of a summative educational document, possibly of the sort given as a prize on completion of a

[37] Licinianus is the most plausible possible addressee for these works. While there has been doubt over the identity of the *fili* addressed, with several scholars suggesting that Salonianus was the recipient of at least some of the works (Gerosa holds the view that the work which he terms the *libri ad Marcum filium* was composed for Salonianus ((1910) 36) and Della Corte believes that this work was originally written for Licinianus, but then revised for his younger brother ((1941) 81 n.1)), it seems ultimately unlikely that Cato would have addressed any of these works to his younger son, a child who would have been barely able to walk and talk at the time of his father's death, and most scholars are clear that it is Licinianus with whom the works are concerned. See, for example, Astin (1978) 332; Gruen (1992) 77.
[38] See below on F1.
[39] See below on Fs 22-6.

particular stage of education.[40] The practical orientation of these texts, which are designed to meet particular personal needs within the instruction of his son, has much in common with Cato's wider written works: the *De agricultura* has long been recognised as a text born of Cato's own experiences of running, and instructing others to run, his estate;[41] the speeches provide an important record of Cato's court history;[42] and the *De re militari*, if not practical in origin, was certainly practical in application, given the manner in which it is cited by Vegetius;[43] there also exists the shadowy *Commentarius de medicina*, which appears to have been a collection of prescriptions gathered from Cato's own experience.[44] There seems little room for doubt, then, that the works addressed to his son were indeed aimed as aids to Licinianus' development, and were produced and likely circulated at the appropriate points in his life.[45]

The putative dates for these texts provided by the practical context of Licinianus' education and development encourage the connection of the works with contemporary events in the careers of the Censor and his son. These connections, in turn, highlight the manifold political advantages which the Catones may have garnered from the timely circulation of these texts amongst their elite peers. These advantages will be explored speculatively in the discussion below, but it is worth observing here that the composition of the *Historia*, which marks the

[40] See below Fs 1-21 with commentary *ad loc.*
[41] The specificity of the text's directions (*Agr*. 18-20), the particular places it mentions (*Agr*. 135), and the absence of archaeological evidence for a large number of villas like Cato's (Terrenato (2012) 69-93) all suggests as much. On the eminently plausible suggestion that the work began as a collection of Cato's notes, see Astin (1978) 195; Dalby (1998) 22-3; Mazzarino (1952) 51-81; White (1973) 447-8.
[42] A record which Cato calls upon vividly in the speech *De Sumptu Suo*, which cites from a previous case; see *ORF*[3] 173 with Courtney (1999) 88-90.
[43] This work was likely to have drawn on Cato's own military experience; its citation by Vegetius confirms the utility of Cato's instructions. On Vegetius' work as a popular practical manual of warfare, see Allmand (2011) 251-348.
[44] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 23.5; Plin. *HN* 29.15.
[45] Later Roman authors have made more creative use of their filial addressees. Seneca the Elder, for example, addresses the *Controversiae* and the *Suasoriae* to his sons (*Controv*. 1 *praef*. 6, 9, 19), long after such instruction would have been of use to them (all three men would be well into their thirties at the time of the works' composition). To suggest such sophistication in the case of Cato's works seems both out of place with the overwhelmingly practical emphasis of the texts and anachronistic given this early stage of the development of Latin literature.

start of Cato's involvement in Licinianus' schooling, would happily coincide with his second, successful campaign for the Censorship, in which he sought to convince voters that he could be responsible for the instruction of the city itself; that the *Liber ad filium*, a text demonstrating Cato's ancestral wisdom, virtue, and practical expertise, would have been produced amidst the string of prosecutions which followed his Censorship; and that the *Epistulae* written by Cato to Licinianus would praise and publicise the youth's military achievements at the start of his public career and in competition with parallel accounts of these events offered by Licinianus' peers.[46] Further to this, the practical nature of all of these documents, and the display which they make of Cato's hands-on experiences in the education of his son, plays well into the public image which the Censor created for himself as an honest and hard-working figure.[47] The ready connection of these works with crucial stages in Cato's career, thus makes for a profitable reading of these texts, regardless of their status as public or private works; yet the value of reading the texts against this political backdrop is greatly increased if we are prepared to speculate that the texts were, in fact, in circulation at this time.

There is no small amount of scholarly support for Cato's circulation of his other practically oriented written works.[48] In his recent edition of the text, Dalby argues persuasively that the *De agricultura* was circulated by the Censor, on the basis that no editor would have published

[46] On the possible political dynamics of these works, see below, p.49-50, 143-5, 192-204.
[47] On Cato's construction of his personal *virtus*, based upon his own *industria*, and the political expediency of this image, see below p.193-7.
[48] There is greater reluctance, in contrast, to see Cato's less practically oriented works, the speeches and the *Origines*, as circulated by the Censor's own hand. The speeches, a useful record of Cato's court proceedings kept for his own practical purposes, while having no ostensible broader didactic application (as with his treatises), have sometimes been seen as available for public consultation; Cicero knew many of Cato's speeches (*Brut*. 65)), and he imagined the Censor as their editor (*Sen*. 38); while of modern critics, both Malcovati (1953) and Dalby (1998) remain distinctly open to the possibilty, although others, including Astin, are inclined to think that Cato did not circulate his speeches as individual products ((1978) 155-6). The *Origines*, the least practically oriented of Cato's literary products, is not normally seen as something which Cato himself circulated; Astin reserves judgement in his chapter on the *Origines* ((1978) 211-39); Cornell concludes of all Cato's works that, 'the most one can say in answer to the question whether Cato intended them 'for publication' is that 'all of these works circulated in the public domain, and were known to later writers' ((2013) 194).

a text of such rough and repetitive qualities.[49] Astin is happy to see all of Cato's technical didactic works as circulated by the Censor's own hand, his growing sense of self-importance prompting the circulation of what were originally domestic works of a practical orientation.[50] Courtney, too, concedes that Cato had the 'intention to publish' the *De agricultura*, finding his justification for this in the work's stylised preface.[51] While some scholars are more reluctant to enter into an assessment of the publication of the works which Cato the Censor addressed to his son, much of the evidence presented for the publication of works such as the *De agricultura* remains valid, I believe, in the case of these texts, and, in particular, of the *Liber ad filium*.[52] The *Liber ad filium* shares its practical purpose and some of the content of its technical instruction with the *De agricultura*; it exhibits, as far as we can tell, a similarly loose internal structure; likewise the *Liber* also displays the strategic polish, most notably in the opening fragments F1, 6, 18, found at certain points within the *De agricultura*. It is difficult to believe that this work alone of Cato's would not have been made available by the Censor, simply because of the presence of a personal addressee.

An important part of the polish found in Cato's works is the range of references which they make to one another. In his description of the *Historia*, Plutarch informs his readers that 'Cato himself states that he wrote a history' (*τὰς ἱστορίας δὲ συγγράψαι φησὶν αὐτός*);[53] the biographer's use of the formula *φησὶν αὐτός* making clear that this history was mentioned by

[49] Dalby (1998) 27.
[50] Astin (1978) 204-5, 208-9. Astin also believes that Cato's work of moral, rather than practical instruction, the *Carmen de moribus*, was written with a view to circulation, and suggests that the *Apophthegmata* may have been made available for copying ((1978) 186).
[51] Courtney (1999) 42.
[52] Astin rightly asserts that there is no evidence for or against Cato's involvement in the publication of these texts, and himself does not believe the *Liber ad filium*, at least, to have been written with a view to publication; however, he attributes to this text a significant position within Cato's creative development, seeing the *Liber ad filium* as Cato's first realisation that he had a talent for aphorism and clear instruction (Astin (1978) 183, 209). Gruen is far more positive about the possibility of the publication of the *Liber*, highlighting its stylised diction and strategic promotion of Roman culture (Gruen (1992) 77-80); and, most recently, Sciarrino, in her emphasis on the performative authority of these works, takes the texts far beyond the question of public or private documents, holding the speech act embodied within them as a permanent entity, both active and objective. See Sciarrino (2011) 158-9.
[53] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.7.

the Censor in another of his works, which Plutarch had then consulted as a source for his biography.[54] In the *Liber ad filium*, Cato made reference to another work of medicinal prescriptions - 'he states that he has a collection of recipes, with which he treats his son, his slaves, and the members of his household' (*profiteturque esse commentarium sibi, quo medeatur filio, servis, familiaribus*) - a text which may have been one and the same work as the *De agricultura*. This text also appears to invoke the opening of the *De agricultura* in its prominent return to the notion of the *vir bonus*.[55] Further to this, we find that the *Origines* included two of the Censor's orations.[56] Cato's propensity to discuss his literary activites cannot be conclusive evidence that he made these works available to the public; however, these cross-references make far more sense in the context of a common knowledge of Cato's works, while the Censor's desire to recall so repeatedly his wider writings suggests that he is making an attempt to publicise his literary achievements.

After noting this apparent self-publicity, it is not difficult to imagine Cato allowing public consultation and circulation of his written works. Many of Cato's didactic works, such as the *Commentarius de medicina* and the *De agricultura*, would have been consulted by members of his household, and may well have been used much more widely than this.[57] This is particularly easy to imagine given the emphasis which Cato places on his agricultural expertise and the importance which such expertise took on during his time as Censor.[58] Cato's household came to be well connected with the wider Roman aristocracy, most

[54] For an examination of Plutarch's use of this phrase, see below p.259-60.
[55] F6, 8, can be seen to recall *Agr. praef.* 2.
[56] The *Pro Rhodiensibus* and the *Contra Ser. Galbam pro direptis Lusitanis*.
[57] On the ready exchange of technological knowledge as a form of inter-elite cultural competition during this period, see Prag and Quinn (2013) 157-178.
[58] Many of Cato's censorial speeches treated agricultural topics, such as the proper maintenance of land (*ORF*$^3$ 124), the distribution of water (*ORF*$^3$ 99-105), and the raising of livestock (*ORF*$^3$ 89, 108); it also appears to be upon his own skills and virtue as an agriculturalist that Cato defends the *lustrum* he made as part of his censorial duties (*ORF*$^3$ 128-35). Indeed, for an interesting perspective on Cato's use of *tabulae* for writing both private household, and formal public documents, highlighting the absence of distinction in the function and terminology of early writing, see Sciarrino (2011) 166-70. On Cato's censorship in general, see below p.192-204.

prominently with the Aemilii, through the marriage of his son to a daughter of Aemilius Paullus. Within this context, it is easy to construct plausible situations for the sharing of these texts and their circulation within small, elite circles: Licinianus may have shared his school books with his in-laws and their children; there is also evidence to suggest that Cato and Polybius read portions of one another's works.[59] The focus that the *Epistulae* place on Licinianus' military achievement, too, would make far more sense in a public context.

Indeed, the absence of a strongly felt distinction between the private and public lives of the Roman elite makes this scenario all the more plausible.[60] Contemporary elite culture habitually placed in public view elements of an aristocrat's life - be that his home, family history, his dead, or his descendants – which are typically felt to be private by modern critics. In particular, the education of one's children was regularly made the subject of public scrutiny, with members of the elite surrounding their children with the finest teachers and resources;[61] not to mention that most physical training of youths would take place in public spaces;[62] that some school classes were taught outside;[63] and that youths would often accompany their fathers to the forum on public business.[64] It is very possible that Cato took part in this educational display by circulating the didactic works which he addressed to his son. In the absence of this clear distinction of private from public life, therefore, the boundary between a text used privately within one's household and document disseminated publicly is

[59] Polybius and Cato came into direct contact when the senate heard the pleas of the Achaean exiles, of whom Polybius was a prominent leader, to be allowed to return to their native land (Polyb. 35.6.1-4; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 9.2-3). One commentator has suggested that Cato's comments on this incident even pick up on Polybius' own self-description; see Sansone (1989) *ad loc.* They were also likely to have been brought into contact through Licinianus, who was brother-in-law to Polybius' most significant patron, Scipio Aemilianus. Polybius quotes Cato's proverbs with admiration on several occasions and thus certainly appears to know of his works (Polyb. 31.25.5, 36.8.7, 36.14.4, 39.1.5-8). Some scholars have argued for a much closer mutual influence over one another's views on political topics, see Cornell (1972) 93.
[60] Flower (1996).
[61] See discussion below p.177-8.
[62] Licinianus' physical training in the Tiber is of relevance here (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.6). On learning to swim more generally, see below, p.175 n.112.
[63] Bloomer (2011) 12-4.
[64] See below p.160-2.

also difficult to fix. While this form of publication would certainly differ from the patterns of *recitationes*, systematic copying and selling of literary works, for which the classical period provides evidence, it nonetheless represents a wider public consultation of Cato's works, which if not instigated, was certainly allowed, by the Censor himself.[65]

The decision to circulate his works publicly would certainly have been an innovative move for Cato; however, this step would come within the context of an emerging and experimental writing career. That the Censor wrote at all was his biggest innovation; yet he went on to polish, and even to edit and re-edit his works. It is not difficult to imagine that Cato then took the further step of allowing others to read and copy these works. Other aristocrats had already published works in Greek, had supported the literary projects of their clients, and had even indulged in their own research endeavours in Latin epigraphy, so such a gesture on Cato's part would not come completely out of the blue.[66]

It seems probable, to my mind, that the works which the Censor addressed to his son were all, in varying manners and degrees, circulated beyond the immediate circle of his private household. This circulation may have involved the consultation of his practical works by his peers, the public knowledge of his private writings, the reading of his works by his extended family, and a wider and more public acquaintance with his works. Allowing a public dynamic to these works enhances our understanding of the life and times of Cato and Licinianus, and is, potentially, greatly illuminating for these men's political careers. However, a pursuit of the political, cultural, and literary elements within these texts does not rely upon their being

[65] Winsbury (2009) 86-91.

[66] Q. Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus had both written histories of Rome in Greek in the late 3rd century BC; the poet Ennius wrote works with the support of Scipio Africanus, for whom he composed a poem, *Scipio*, on Scipio's African campaigns, and with the support of M. Fulvius Nobilior, for whom he composed a *fabula praetextata*, *Ambracia*, on his capture of the city; it has also been suggested that Nobilior's *fasti*, likely to be an inscription featured somewhere in his temple complex, the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, were a piece of research he had carried out with Ennius' assistance; see Rüpke (2006).

placed within the public realm by their author at their time of writing, which, given that this is ultimately unprovable, is probably wise.

## 2.3 Overview of the Works

As has been noted above, a wealth of textual material has accumulated around the relationship of Cato the Censor and his eldest son, Licinianus. This section offers, firstly, a brief overview of that material, with the aim to build up a picture of the literary context for the works which we know the Censor to have addressed to his son;[67] secondly, it looks in more detail at those works in which Licinianus was addressed, placing them within the literary context set out and thus preparing for the following edition, of which they form the focus.

The accumulated material surrounding the Censor and his relationship with his son includes a variety of later works which seek to re-echo and reconstruct elements of that relationship. Most prominent amongst these works are several of the *De officiis* of Cicero, Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, and the anonymous *Disticha Catonis*. These didactic works are all associated with a father's instruction to his son and they present the content of that instruction as finding an inspiration and a precedent in the works which Cato addressed to Licinianus. These works demonstrate the importance of the relationship within the ancient reception of the Censor's life and literary works and are discussed in full in the third section of this thesis.[68]

[67] This material includes other works written by the Censor, as well as later works which allude to the relationship; the literary context set out here thus has both synchronic and diachronic elements.
[68] See below p.206-53.

The textual material which surrounds the Censor's relationship with his son also includes content which Cato wrote about Licinianus, rather than addressed to him. Plutarch informs us that Cato 'often mentioned his son in his writings as being a fine man' (*μέμνηται μὲν αὐτοῦ* [Licinianus] *πολλάκις ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις ὁ* Κάτων *ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ γεγονότος*).[69] None of the extant fragments of Cato's works describe or discuss Licinianus in these exact terms,[70] but given the autobiographical content of Cato's wider works, particularly the speeches and the *Origines*, it is probable that Licinianus did indeed feature in them in a positive light.[71] Cicero, too, has his character Cato refer to the fine qualities of his son, whom he describes as 'excellent' (*optimus*),[72] and as 'unsurpassable both in his excellence and in his faithful loyalty to his father' (*quo nemo vir melior natus est, nemo pietate praestantior*).[73] While Cicero's Cato is a fictional character, his creator was a careful and accurate historian and is likely to have a Catonian source for these words about his son.[74] There exists, therefore, a general context of paternal praise for the character and actions of Licinianus within the wider works of the Censor, most likely the speeches and the *Origines*, against which the works addressed to him must be set.

Almost all of Cato's wider didactic works can be placed amongst the texts associated with his relationship with his son. With the exception of the fully extant *De agricultura*, all of Cato's

[69] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 24.10.
[70] Several fragments of the *Liber ad filium*, Fs 6 and 18, instruct Licinianus in how to be a fine man (*vir bonus*), but this is something rather different.
[71] On the autobiographical content of the *Origines* particularly, see Cornell (2009) 15-40. Given that Licinianus played a role in at least one of the military campaigns described in the *Origines* it is difficult to argue that he did not, in fact, feature in those parts of the work. Licinianus' presence in the speeches is more difficult to ascertain; however, we know that Cato had much to say on the subject of fathers, sons, and their education (*ORF*$^{3}$ 172: on the subject of paternal instruction; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22.5-7: on Cato's disruption of the teaching of the Athenian philosophers in Rome; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 8.6: for one of Cato's famous saying on the youth of his age).
[72] Cic. *Sen.* 15, 68.
[73] Cic. *Sen.* 84.
[74] On the reliability of Cicero's *De senectute* as a source for Cato's life, see below p.232 n.119.

didactic works have been connected with an address to Licinianus.[75] These include a *Carmen de moribus,* a *De re militari,* a *Commentarius de medicina,* and a *Commentarius de iure civili*. Perspectives on these texts vary. Some scholars see these as independent works, either lacking an addressee or lacking in evidence of the presence of an addressee;[76] while others have taken these works not only to be addressed to Licinianus, but also to have formed part of an encyclopaedic work dedicated to his education.[77] This work is usually termed the '*Libri' ad filium*. In most cases there is little or no evidence to associate these wider didactic works with Licinianus or with the small collection of moral and practical advice, the *Liber ad filium,* which we know that the Censor did dedicate to his son. However, the similarity of content between the works has encouraged the assimilation of these didactic works into the *Liber* – then expanded to *'Libri'* - addressed by Cato to Licinianus. These works are reviewed here as part of the background of knowledge and experience from which Cato also drew the contents of the *Liber ad filium*.

The *Carmen de moribus*, a work known to us through three citations made by Gellius, largely maintains its independence from the *Liber ad filium*. This is due to the clear title given to the work by Gellius, who cites several lines 'in the book by Cato which is entitled *Carmen de moribus*' (*in libro Catonis, qui inscriptus est Carmen de moribus*),[78] as well as to the distinct rhythmic nature of the prose of these citations, which differs markedly from other citations

[75] While the addressee of the *De agricultura* fluctuates, varying and fading in and out of the work, it is clearly incompatible with Licinianus. This confirms, at the very least, that not all of Cato's didactic works were addressed to his son.

[76] This is the prevailing modern view, first articulated definitively by Astin, who sought to disengage these texts from the *Liber* addressed to Licinianus (1978) 332-40; followed more recently by Gruen (1992) 76-7, Suerbaum and Bländsdorf (2002) 409-13, and Cornell (2013) 194 n.4.

[77] This interpretation was first offered by Jahn (1850), achieving a broad following, including Leo (1913) 276ff; *RE* s.v. Porcius, no. 9, cols. 146g; Gerosa (1910); Della Corte (1941), (1946) 19-32; Barwick (1948); Kienast (1954) 104-5, Grimal (1965-6); Roos (1984) 27; and most recently Bloomer (1997) 117. A few variants of Jahn's interpretation have been offered; Marmorale wished to include the *Historia* within the encyclopaedia (1949) 142; Krenkel saw the *De re militari* as a separate work from the encyclopaedia (1959); and Schmidt saw the encylcopaedia as an extended epistle sent to Licinianus after his success at Pydna (1972). Although Jordan expressed some doubts ((1860) xcix-cii), this interpretation was first significantly questioned by Mazzarino (1952) 23ff.

[78] Gell. *NA* 11.2.2.

ascribed to the *Liber ad filium*.[79] The moral and didactic contents of the work – the extant fragments treat the evils of avarice, look back to simpler ages past, and exhort an active lifestyle – has led to some confusion between the *Carmen de moribus* and the *Liber ad filium*. The manuscript tradition of the *Disticha Catonis* associates the *Carmen de moribus* with the *Liber ad filium*, describing the *Disticha* as a work somewhere between the two; a manuscript of the *Disticha*, belonging to Simeone Bosius (or Dubois), a 16th century judge from Limoges, is entitled 'The *Disticha* on tradition of Dionysius Cato, for his son' (*Dionysii Catonis disticha de moribus ad filium*).[80] This title seemingly conflates the addressee of the *Liber ad filium* with the content of the *Carmen de moribus* and absorbs it into the *Disticha Catonis*.[81] Indeed, while Cato's *Carmen de moribus* was clearly a work distinct from the *Liber* addressed to his son, it is apparent that in the later history of his writings, these two were compared and conflated.[82]

Also associated with Licinianus as its intended audience is the *De re militari*. This influential didactic monograph on generalship was based on Cato's personal experience of military command and was practical in nature.[83] It included discussion of the importance of night watches,[84] of different military formations,[85] furnishing this discussion with specific examples,[86] as well as some more aphoristic content.[87] Several scholars have sought to place the fragments of this work within the *Liber ad Filium*;[88] claiming that such instruction would

[79] The work's title, *Carmen de moribus*, has led some – mistakenly – to believe that this was a verse work; for a full bibliography, see Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001) *ad loc.*
[80] Roos (1984) 194.
[81] For further discussion of the *Disticha Catonis*, see below p.245-52; for the attribution of the work to a Dionysius Cato, see Boas (1930) 649-656.
[82] Of modern scholars, Roos does not directly confuse these two works, but he readily assumes an address to Licinianus for the *Carmen de moribus* ((1984) 28).
[83] See above p.22 n.43.
[84] F6.
[85] F8.
[86] F13a and b.
[87] F3.
[88] See above p.30 n.77.

have been of benefit to Licinianus as he began his military career, and suggesting that this portion of the text may have been used by the Censor to complement the practical training that he gave to his son in endurance, weaponry, and horsemanship.[89] However, the testimonia to the work do not mention Licinianus as its addressee or his instruction as its purpose. In fact, Vegetius ascribes a most general aim to Cato in this work, claiming that he believed 'he would benefit the republic' (*se rei publicae credidit profuturum*) by writing on the subject of military discipline (*si disciplinam militarem conferret in litteras*).[90] Nor does the manner in which the work is cited suggest that it can be positively associated with Cato's son or with the *Liber* addressed to him. For both Pliny and Vegetius the work is known as *De militari disciplina*,[91] while the most popular description of the work is *De re militari*.[92] Even Servius and Nonius, both of whom also cite from the *Liber ad filium* do not conflate the two works, clearly distinguishing Cato's *De re militari*,[93] from citations found in his *oratione ad filium*,[94] *libris ad filium de agricultura*,[95] and his *praeceptis ad filium*,[96] as they variously refer to the *Liber*. While the topic is one on which Cato was very likely to wish to advise his son,[97] it is not possible to connect the *De re militari* either with an address to Licinianus, or with the *Liber ad filium*. The work must be viewed as an independent treatise, albeit one which treated a subject that the Censor would certainly have discussed with his son.[98]

[89] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.6; on this particularly, see Marmorale (1949) 142.
[90] Veg. *Mil*. 2.3.6.
[91] Plin. *HN praef*. 30; Veg. *Mil*. 1.8.10, 1.15.4.
[92] Festus, *Gloss. Lat*. p.298 l.36ff., p.400. l.6ff., p.466 l.28ff. L.; Gell. *NA* 6.4.5; Prisc. *Inst*. 2. p.334 l.16-7. K.
[93] Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg*. 2.417; Non. p.301 l.32-3 L., p.741 l.3-4. L., p.890 l.23ff L.
[94] Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg*. 1.46.
[95] Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg*. 2.412.
[96] Non. p.208 l.7-8. L.
[97] It is possible that Cato offers Licinianus advice on military matters in one or more of his letters, which mention pirates, the notion of taming, and destruction (Fs 23-5); however, these citations are too fragmentary to make any such conclusion certain.
[98] Cato has good precedent for writing an independent monograph on military command in Xenophon, an author with whom we know he was familiar. Scholars have seen an allusion to the opening of the *Symposium* at the beginning of the *Origines*: F2 *FRHist*. is often compared with Xen. *Symp*. 1.1. The allusion is well established; see the bibliography given by Letta (1984) 12 n. 53, while Garbarino discusses some of the nuances of Cato's use of the phrase ((1973) 340-42). Similarities have also been noted between the organisation of the opening chapters of Cato's *De agricultura* and Xenophon's treatise *De Equitandi Ratione*, see Leo (1913) 275-6;

Several sources tell us that Cato also wrote on the subject of civil law,[99] and again, scholars have wished to see this work as part of the *Liber ad filium.*[100] We do know that Cato advised Licinianus on legal matters in at least one letter,[101] and the legal career which his son went on to pursue makes it all the more tempting to think that his father addressed the topic in the *Liber ad filium*. However, there is no clear evidence to connect the legal works of the Elder Cato - and these are rather shadowy productions themselves - with an address to his son, or with the *Liber ad filium*. Nonetheless, the work by Cato on civil law must have been important background for the legal advice which he offered to his son on different occasions.

Sources also testify to a treatise on medicine, typically referred to as the *Commentarius de medicina*, written by the Censor.[102] Scholars have seen this treatise as a source for, and even as a part of, the *Liber ad filium*;[103] however, the nature of this *Commentarius de medicina* is, in fact, very difficult to make out. Pliny's citation implies that Cato mentioned this *Commentarius* within the *Liber ad filium*, making it unlikely that the work was a sub-section of that text.[104] It is possible that the *Commentarius* was a fully independent treatise on medical topics; however, if this were the case then it is remarkable that we have no citations

---

Münscher (1920) 70-4; and, more recently, Leigh (2004a) 148-52. More generally, the works of both authors teach practical skills on a variety of topics all related to their own experience and expertise.

[99] We are told that both father and son wrote on the subject (Pomponius *Dig*. 1.2.2.38); Festus attributes a passage of legal discussion to a Cato - most likely the Elder given that this is Festus' typical manner of referring to the Censor (Festus, *Gloss. Lat*. p.144 l.17ff L.); while the *regula Catoniana* may have been a product of either father or son (*Dig*. 34.7), so too the work mentioned by Cicero (*De or*. 2.142), and that discussed at Paulus *Dig*. 45.1.4.1; however, given the established legal reputation of Licinianus, it is difficult to build a case to attribute these last three texts to his father.

[100] See above p.30 n.79. Several modern scholars continue to uphold the presence of legal subjects within the *Liber ad Filium*, even without subscribing to the theory of the work as an encyclopaedia; see Guarino (1985) 69-81, supported tentatively by Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi ((2001) *ad* F2). Notably, Guarino also has the Censor responsible for the *regula Catoniana*, and attributes much to the shared legal interest of father and son ((1987) 41-9).

[101] F22.

[102] Plin. *HN* 29.15; Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 23.5.

[103] Most scholars conflate these works on the theory that the *Liber ad filium* was an encyclopaedic work; see above p.30 n.77; however, some see the *Commentarius de medicina* as a separate text, distinctly related to the medical sections of the *Liber*; Mazzarino (1952) 19-22, 24-5; Boscherini (1993) 730-2; Cornell (2013) 194.

[104] See below on F2.

made from the work's content.[105] This suggests that the *Commentarius* was never published and thus was not available for the consultation of later writers. There may be some evidence to suggest this in the terms used by the sources to describe the work: both *commentarius* and *ὑπόμνημα* can refer to a work of notes and memoranda,[106] although this is certainly not always the case.[107] Whatever its exact form or publication status, it is probable that this work acted as a source text for the *Liber ad filium* and the medical sections of the *De agricultura*.[108] Therefore, while it is quite possible this that *commentarius* formed the basis for a section on medicine within the *Liber ad filium*, there is no evidence to associate the work with the *Liber* or with Licinianus in a more significant manner than this.

Although many of the wider didactic works attributed to Cato share similar content with those works which he addressed to his son, most notably the *Liber ad filium*, there is no positive evidence for the assumption that these works were also addressed by the Censor to his son, or that they were part of a proposed enlarged version of the *Liber*, the so-called *'Libri' ad filium*. In some cases, there is much evidence to suggest that the work in question was an independent treatise. Nonetheless, it is important to note the long history of confusion between these works, from which we can surmise much about the manner in which these texts were circulated, read, and edited. The tone and content shared between the works which addressed Licinianus and the Censor's wider didactic works also demonstrates that the same

[105] If this were the case, we would expect Pliny, who knew Cato's scientific writings well, to have cited from the text. In fact, all of Pliny's citations from Cato on medical topics can be traced to the *De agricultura*; see Astin (1978) 336. On the unlikelihood of Pliny procuring the text, see further Mazzarino (1952) 23-4, 28-9.

[106] A *commentarius* typically denotes a 'notebook' or 'private journal' (*OLD* s.v. *commentarius* 1a; while a *ὑπόμνημα* a 'note' or 'memorandum' (*LSJ* s.v. *ὑπόμνημα* II.2).

[107] The title of *commentarius* is frequently given to published works, particularly those which pose as unpolished, and hence unbiased, accounts of facts or historical events; Caesar's *commentarii* on his campaigns are well known examples of this; Cicero, too, makes reference to a *commentarius* on his consulship, which he suggests is suitable for publication (*Att.* 2.1.1-2). While our evidence suggests that Cato's *Commentarius de medicina* was not published, the notion of some of his wider works, and particularly the *Liber ad filium*, posing as unpolished products would allow Cato to enhance his image as a practical man, as well as explaining much of their roughness; for further discussion of this idea, see below p.193-7.

[108] In fact, it cannot be ruled out that this title is not simply a reference to these sections of the *De agricultura*; see below on F2.

body of knowledge and experience was behind the composition of all these texts, and suggests that that in spite of their differing addressees, the works held similar aims.[109] While they should not be confused, then, these texts are certainly worth considering together.

The material associated with Cato the Censor's relationship with his son also includes a number of educational sayings and proverbs. There exist many pieces of educational advice which are not connected directly with Licinianus, but which may, nevertheless have been addressed to him. Seneca the Younger, for example, cites Cato on avoiding the expense of luxuries;[110] Plutarch has Cato exhort the young to courage in battle;[111] and Diomedes Grammaticus quotes the Censor on the value of learning.[112] These are just a handful of examples from a wide variety of such pieces of advice, exhortation, and instruction, found throughout Cato's writings. It is likely that some of this advice was collected into an anthology or anthologies, either by Cato himself or by a later editor, which will have formed the basis for late works such as the *Disticha Catonis*.[113] Indeed, the Censor was a very popular figure of wisdom, even becoming proverbial himself.[114] The existence of such collections confirms that Cato offered Licinianus, and likely the youth of Rome more widely, a variety of exhortation and instruction. This advice may have been collected into a particular work by the Censor himself, although we have no evidence which specifically indicates this, and it is likely that these sayings were compiled by later editors. This anthology (or

[109] Indeed, their similar content likely derived from shared source notes, which may have been directly repeated on more than one occasion; see below p.71-2.
[110] Sen. *Ep*. 94.27-8.
[111] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 9.5.
[112] Diom. 1 p.310 l.3-4 K.
[113] Such collections of the sayings of wise men were a popular category of ancient biography; see Lewis (1991), (1993). Plutarch himself makes use of one such collection as a source for chapters eight and nine of his *Life of Cato Maior*, as well as for chapter twenty six of his *Life of Fabius Maximus*. Similar collections were also made from the works of famous authors, hence the *Sententiae Menandri* and the *Sententiae* of Publilius Syrus. It is difficult to speculate who first gathered together material from Cato's life and works, when this might have happened, and how much of that material is genuinely Catonian. It is possible that Cato himself was involved in this process, and it is probable that such collections were already in existence by the time of Cicero and Nepos (Jordan (1860) cvi). On the connection of such collections to the *Disticha Catonis*, see below p.246-8.
[114] Otto (1890) s.v. Cato.

anthologies) was influential in proliferating the impression of Cato as a father and an educator, as well as being influenced by this impression in their composition and circulation. These works form an important part of the later constructions of Cato as a proverbial figure of paternal wisdom and are useful in furthering our understanding of the works which he addressed to his son.

It is important to distinguish this educational advice from the anthology of witticisms which we know Cato to have compiled in his old age.[115] This work seems not to have had a serious didactic function,[116] but instead to have collected clever and witty remarks from a host of famous men (*multaque multorum facete dicta*),[117] likely including the Censor himself,[118] and is listed by Cicero as an example of a particular kind of wit that is 'refined, polished, clever, whimsical,' (*elegans, urbanum, ingeniosum, facetum*).[119] The *Apophthegmata* – the work's title as given by Cicero – is thus of a different nature to a collection of the educational sayings of Cato described above. Both this collection and that described in the preceding paragraph may have served as a source for later editors seeking a variety of Cato's sayings, but there is no convincing argument that these works were one and the same anthology.[120] Nor is there any clear reason to associate the *Apophthegmata* with an address to Licinianus independent of this conflation of the two collections. Cicero's description of the work as it stands does not make Licinianus a plausible audience: the work is not presented as a didactic

[115] Described by Cicero at *Off*. 1.104, *De or*. 2.271.
[116] Cicero states that it was to be read in one's leisure time (*Off*. 1.103).
[117] Cic. *Off*. 1.104.
[118] It would be most uncharacteristic of Cato to pass up the opportunity to revisit some of his own finer oratorical moments. Further to this, evidence from Plutarch suggests that there were traditional Greek sayings in Latin translation featured within this work (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 2.6); Cicero cites a quotation of Gaius Publicius as part of this collection (*De or*. 2.271), and it seems likely that Cato's pun upon the *cognomen* of Fulvius Nobilior was also included within this collection (*ORF*$^{3}$ 151 = Cic. *De or*. 2.256).
[119] Cic. *Off*. 1.104.
[120] Indeed, our sources clearly define the *Apophthegmata* as a distinct Catonian creation. While this work was likely embellished with further Catonian (and non-Catonian) material into a broader collection of wise sayings attributed to the Censor – quite possibly that described above - it did not originate in this way. As such, while Cugusi and Sbendorio Cugusi's (2001) amalgamation of the *Apophthegmata* into to this wider collection of Catonian sayings is a pragmatic recognition of the difficulty of separating out this material, Jordan's (1860) distinction between the two works is truer to the original form of Cato's works.

piece, but rather as a source book for puns and witticisms suitable for oratory.[121] It is difficult to see why Cato would address this to an adult son who had made his profession in civil law, rather than in the court room. The confusion of these collections highlights just how many different anthologies of advice may have been connected with the Censor in some way and how readily these came to be associated with an address to his son.

Amidst the mass of material which has been associated with Cato's relationship and with Licinianus are several works which we know the Censor to have addressed to his son. It is these texts which will form the focus of the following edition. As has already been noted, these works are not always easy to separate from the wider range of material associated with the relationship of Censor and son, nor are they simple to distinguish from one another. It is useful, then, to survey the works briefly here.

The *Historia*, a historical work written as a reading aid for the young Licinianus, is likely the earliest, and is the first work featured in this edition, T1. The *Historia*, we are told, offered Licinianus a handy guide to his Roman heritage in large, easy-to-read letters.

The next work featured in this edition is the *Liber ad filium*, Fs 1-21. This short work offers Licinianus instruction in several topics, including medicine, agriculture, and oratory - all skills traditionally associated with a successful *pater familias*. The tone and style of this instruction varies – detailed practical advice is given alongside oracular statements, generalised precepts, and polemic. The text is marked by distinctive addresses to Licinianus as 'Marcus, my son' (*Marce fili*), at several points. These addresses suggest that the work may have strong connections with the oral and informal instruction characteristic of early

[121] This impression is further confirmed by Quintilian, who ascribes to Cato a statment on the importance of urbane wit to oratory (*Inst.* 6.3.105). The rhetorical value of the collection is highlighted by Calboli (1981) 41-5.

Roman education. The work has been read and edited in a variety of different ways, and has often been connected with epistolary writing, as well as with the didactic genre, by scholars. Some of the different scholarly perspectives on the work – which range from seeing it as an encyclopaedia to an *ad hoc* collection of maxims - have been touched upon in discussion above, and they will be elucidated further in the commentary and analysis below. This text has been particularly influential in later ideas of the relationship between the Censor and his son and has been particularly prone to the absorption of and association with a wide variety of other texts. This makes the *Liber ad filium* both a significant and a challenging text to edit here.

The *Epistulae* are several letters which the Censor addressed to his son whilst Licinianus served on military campaign, these are treated last as Fs 22-6. These works offered advice and instruction on a variety of topics, all arising from the challenges posed by Licinianus' immediate circumstances. These texts represent Cato's continued interest in the development of his son and in the promotion of his political career.

From amidst the mass of material associated with the relationship of Cato and Licinianus, it is thus possible to identify a series of texts in which the Censor addressed his son. While these works can be difficult to distinguish from the wide ranging textual material which surrounds them, and at times, are even awkward to disentangle from one other, it is certainly a worthwhile endeavour to pursue these texts and their interpretation as individual works. Seen as distinct textual products, these works can be considered in their own right, as well as as part of the picture they provide of one of Cato's most important relationships.

Two important points should be noted going forward from the discussion of this section. The first is the popularity of the Censor's relationship with his son and its predominance within received impressions of his life and literary works. The works in which Cato addresses Licinianus exhibit a clear tendency to absorb and attract other works: the *Origines* has been seen as derivative of the *Historia*; almost all of Cato's didactic works have been readily absorbed into the *Liber ad filium*; collections of advice have been attributed to the Censor addressing his son. This readiness to associate a wide range of texts with the relationship of father and son suggests Cato emphasised his paternal duties within his public career and that the relationship appealed to the imaginations of later writers and editors of his works.

The second is the confusion which exists over the exact form and content of these works. This confusion is likely to originate with the impromptu and informal manner in which the texts were initially circulated. The similarities in content and addressee that these texts share with other works of the Censor are also likely to have helped this confusion. This would be further enhanced by the works' popularity – they were frequently cited and re-cited in a variety of authors. The short length of these works, and the consequent likelihood of them being edited together, will have furthered the confusion between them.[122] The complexities surrounding the works which the Censor addressed to his son thus extend beyond the normal questions of title and text which are involved in the editing of any ancient work. The precarious state of the works which the Censor addressed to his son suggests that any treatment of these texts must be a cautious one; while their popularity highlights the

[122] It should also be acknowledged that some of this apparent confusion may derive from Cato's repetion of material from work to work. The shared source material of these texts makes this eminently probable. The practice was a common one amongst such prolific authors – Varro offers an excellent parallel - and material found in more than one of Cato's texts could then have been cited, quite legitimately, under various different descriptions and titles, thus explaining some of the apparent confusion between individual Catonian works. See below, especially on F3 and 16.

importance of a systematic analysis of these works, their wider significance within Cato's life and times, and their legacy.

## 2.4 The Selection of the Fragments

In total there are twenty six different citations from, and one testimonium to, individual works addressed by Cato to his son Licinianus. These twenty six direct citations are quoted forty times; most are quoted only once, but F1 and 2 are both quoted twice, and the most popular, F18, is quoted seven times.[123] For the exact distribution of citations, see table 1.

Table 1

| Fragment | Number of Citations |
|---|---|
| **F1** | 2 |
| **F2** | 2 |
| **F3** | 3 |
| **F4** | 2 |
| **F5** | 1 |
| **F6** | 1 |
| **F7** | 1 |
| **F8** | 1 |
| **F9** | 1 |
| **F10** | 1 |
| **F11** | 2 |
| **F12** | 2 |
| **F13** | 1 |
| **F14** | 2 |
| **F15** | 1 |
| **F16** | 1 |
| **F17** | 1 |
| **F18** | 7 |

[123] These totals include both verbatim quotations and paraphrases; they do not include the allusions to and adaptations of Cato's text which are discussed, where significant, in the accompanying commentary.

| | |
|---|---|
| **F19** | 1 |
| **F20** | 1 |
| **F21** | 1 |
| **F22** | 1 |
| **F23** | 1 |
| **F24** | 1 |
| **F25** | 1 |
| **F26** | 1 |

These citations are made by eighteen different authors. The most frequent citer of the works which the Censor addressed to his son was Pliny the Elder, who quotes from the *Liber ad filium* seven times in total. He is followed by Plutarch, who cites from both the *Liber ad filium* and the *Epistulae* a combined total of five times, as well as providing our sole testimonium to the *Historia*, and then by Columella, who cites from the *Liber* five times. An exact depiction of the citing sources is given below, see table 2.

Table 2

| Author | Number of citations |
|---|---|
| Pliny the Elder | 7 |
| Plutarch | 5 |
| Columella | 5 |
| Servius | 4 |
| Quintilian | 2 |
| Julius Victor | 2 |
| Festus | 2 |
| Priscian | 2 |
| Diomedes Grammaticus | 2 |
| Nonius | 1 |
| Celsus | 1 |
| Catullus | 1 |
| Seneca | 1 |
| Fortunatianus | 1 |
| Cassiodorus | 1 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Fronto | 1 |
| Cicero | 1 |
| Incertus Auctor | 1 |

The citing sources have a variety of interests within Cato's works; most cite the Censor for the informative content of his advice, be that instruction on agriculture, medicine, law or rhetoric. In these instances, Cato's opinion is often invoked to add authority to the author's own views and it regularly acts as the final word in a discussion. Pliny and Columella, frequent citers of Cato, fall clearly into this category. There are, nonetheless, several grammarians who cite Cato's works purely for linguistic reasons: Priscian, Nonius, Festus, and Diomedes, all preserve short, verbatim fragments of the Censor's works for reasons of lexical or morphological interest. None of our authors, with the exception of Plutarch, cite these fragments out of an interest in Cato as a character or in his relationship with his son in and of itself.

The majority of our citations are quoted, or certainly claim to be quoted, verbatim; seventeen of the twenty six quotations are made in this manner. The remaining nine citations are all quoted in paraphrase. Further to this, of the twenty six fragments and one testimonium, fourteen citations are directly associated with an address to Licinianus, either directly by the words which are cited, or by the citing source's description of the quotation. The other thirteen citations presented within this edition have clear connections with Licinianus as their addressee, share content with the works addressed to him, or fail to find a place within Cato's wider works, despite being clearly attributed to him. Usually all three of these elements play a part in the attribution of these fragments to these *ad filium* works.

While a detailed discussion of the manner of citation and the citing source can be found in the commentary accompanying each fragment, these tables and statistics provide a useful overview of the way in which the works which Cato addressed to Licinianus have survived.[124] This overview strongly suggests that the *Liber ad filium*, repeatedly cited for the information that it contained on medicine, agriculture, and rhetoric, was a well known work of widespread didactic authority; within this text, Cato's teachings on oratory were remarkably popular, but the work in all its parts was much cited from the 1st century BC onwards by didactic authors. The *Epistulae* were less well known than the *Liber ad filium*, but these too appear to have been consulted for the content of the advice that they offered as early as the 1st century BC. Both works were of interest to later grammarians, most of whom were likely to have been citing at second hand, for their unusual linguistic forms. Similarly, Plutarch's interest in both of these works and the biographical information which they yield about Cato's learning and family life is apparent. The sole testimonium to the *Historia*, which was also provided by the biographer suggests that it was unlikely to have been available in full text and it seems little known at all.

This overview also offers a positive picture of the texts presented in this edition. While some of Cato's words are clearly cited in paraphrase, and in these instances caution must be exercised, on the whole, the fragments presented here are largely cited verbatim and, although there can be no ruling out of the possibility of miscitation, the text is thus broadly reliable. In most cases, the fragments presented in the edition are denoted as belonging to one of the works addressed by the Censor to his son; in the cases where this is not made clear either by the quotation or by the citing source, there exist compelling reasons for placing them within one of these works. It is thus possible to conclude that, while elements of the

[124] With the exception of Cato's biographer, Plutarch, who is treated separately in the appendix, see below p.257-62.

form and style of the works which Cato addressed to Licinianus elude the small number and short length of these citations, the fragments as presented here offer a positive representation of the original texts, as shown by the high proportion of secure, verbatim citations which they include and the general emphasis of our sources in preserving the specific content of Cato's words.

## 2.5 A Note on Previous Editions

There have been several previous editions which feature the fragments treated here. The earliest of these is that of Jordan (1860), who collected all of the fragments of the Censor's works, with the exception of the fully extant *De agricultura*, into a single volume.[125] Jordan's edition featured in his *Libri ad Filium* many of the citations included here as part of the *Liber ad filium*, as well as the testimonium to the *Historia* amongst his *Incertorum Librorum Reliquiae*, and the fragments of our *Epistulae* in an equivalent section. Jordan's edition also featured a full apparatus criticus and an extensive introduction discussing each work. Jordan's work has been the starting point for all subsequent editors of Cato.

Also of importance for this edition has been that of Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001). Paolo Cugusi and Maria Theresa Sblendorio Cugusi's edition of the complete works of Cato has provided a thorough introduction to each work and commentary on each fragment. Their edition significantly enlarges upon Jordan's construction of the works which Cato addressed to his son, adopting a distinct methodology in attributing new fragments to the text. This

[125] Slightly earlier than the edition of Jordan was that of Compagnoni and Berengo (1846); this edition of Cato's collected works features a *praecepta ad filium* which contained the basis of our *Liber ad filium*. The edition, however, lacks a thorough commentary on and a clear rationale towards Cato's fragmentary works, rendering it of limited use. The new edition of the work, published in 2014 with a fresh introduction by Helga Di Giuseppe, updates the edition with new archaeological research, but offers no improvements upon the text.

enlarged edition of the *Liber ad filium* has been of particular value for the construing of the fragments here.

The numbering of the fragments in Jordan and Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi is included in my edition below.

The edition of Schönberger (1980) also features the works addressed by Cato to his son, which he describes as the *Libri ad Marcum Filium*, as part of his edition of Cato's works. Schönberger offers a useful preliminary discussion of the texts, but no full analysis. Till (1976) includes the *Libri ad Marcum Filium*, a rather slighter collection than in previous editions – with several fragments repositioned elsewhere, along with Cato's wider works in his collection of Latin literature from the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC. Some of the fragments treated in this edition have also featured in more specific collections, such as that of Speranza (1974), who gathers all of Cato's fragments which treat agricultural topics, many of which are widely associated with an address to Licinianus, into his volume of fragmentary agricultural writers. Similary, the testimonium to Cato's *Historia* finds its way into the edition of the fragmentary Roman historians edited by Cornell (2013).[126]

The edition offered below is thus far from unprecedented; however, it is unique in its focus solely upon the *ad filium* works, while the depth of its analysis offered upon these texts, and its efforts to place them within the wider contexts of the 2nd century BC and of the Censor's lasting legacy, set it apart from what has come before. It is hoped, therefore, that it adds something new to the collection of different editions of Cato described above.

[126] T6b *FRHist*.

### 2.5.1 *Historia*

**T. 1** *καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας δὲ συγγράψαι φησὶν αὐτὸς ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ καὶ μεγάλοις γράμμασιν, ὅπως οἴκοθεν ὑπάρχοι τῷ παιδὶ πρὸς ἐμπειρίαν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ πατρίων ὠφελεῖσθαι·*

Cato himself says that he wrote histories with his own hand and in large letters, so that his son might have at home a resource to help him gain an acquaintance with the ancient and ancestral ways.

Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.7

*Incertorum Librorum Reliquiae* F72 J. = *Commentarius de Historia* F1 C.

The *Historia* is mentioned amongst our sources only by Plutarch, who includes this reference to the work in his description of Cato's education of his eldest son, Marcus Porcius Cato Licinianus. The lengthy description of Licinianus' instruction given by Plutarch forms part of the central section of his biography, which focuses upon the Censor's private life and, in particular, upon his actions as a husband and father.[127] Indeed, Plutarch presents Cato as a remarkably diligent father, heavily involved in his son's education, and gives the production of the *Historia* as just one example of Cato's paternal efforts in this direction.[128] While Plutarch does not cite directly from the *Historia*, his description of the work does give an indication as to its purposes, its content, the date of its composition, and its possible circulation.

[127] On the accuracy of Plutarch's account, see below p.257-62.

[128] Cato does not appear to have directly addressed his son within the *Historia*; however, the work was dedicated to Licinianus' educational needs and was designed for his use. In this sense, the *Historia* has parallels with Asconius' commentary on Cicero's speech *Pro Milone*, which was produced with care to satisfy the curiosity of his sons about the events of the case, but does not directly address the youths themselves (Asc. *Mil.* 39). On the broader tradition of didactic works which are addressed directly from father to son, see below p.206 n.2.

Plutarch's description of the work as written 'in large letters' (*μεγάλοις γράμμασιν*), shows that it was designed as an aid for one learning to read.[129] This information allows us to date the work's composition with relative certainty. Roman children learnt to read with the beginning of their formal education, around the age of six or seven;[130] indeed, in the case of Licinianus, we are told that Cato taught the boy to read as soon as possible, and a date of around 186 can thus be assumed for the composition of the work.[131]

In addition to helping Licinianus learn to read, the *Historia*, Plutarch tells us, was also composed with the aim of providing the boy with a home-made guide to the customs and stories of his ancestors. It is difficult to estimate the exact content of the history from Plutarch's description 'the ancient and ancestral ways,' (*τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ πατρίων*).[132] It is probable that this phrase describes a work which instructed Licinianus in the history of Rome through the stories of the heroes of the Republic.[133] Indeed, Plutarch's *τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ πατρίων* may even be a Greek translation of the Latin *mos maiorum*, a phrase which was often used to describe the virtues embodied in the heroes of the early Republic, found in one of Plutarch's sources.[134] Our evidence also suggests that the heroic actions of the Porcii,

[129] Although in later ages Roman children learnt to read Greek letters first, only learning Latin at a later stage (Quint. *Inst.* 1.1.13; Petron. *Sat.* 46.5), it seems unlikely, at this early date, that Licinianus began his literary education by learning Greek from the *Historia*. On the connections of the *Historia* to the popular Hellenistic early reader, the *gnomologium*, see below p.167.

[130] Quintilian was an advocate of learning to read at a very early age, and cites Chrysippus as an important antecedent for his views (Quint. *Inst.* 1.1.15-9); however, as the rhetorician himself admits, most authorities – Quintilian gives Hesiod as the earliest source of this view and Eratosthenes as a prominent exponent of it - held that around seven years was the optimal point at which to begin training in literacy. On the beginnings of primary education, see Bonner (1977) 33-46.

[131] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.5. An early date for the work is also suggested by Plutarch's use of *οἴκοθεν*; the adverb stresses the early stage at which Cato began to teach his son the traditions of his fathers – while the child was still spending most of his time about the home, rather than at school, or as a youth about the city of Rome. On the role of the city, her monuments and inscriptions, in offering instruction in Roman history and tradition in the later stages of development, see Rawson (2003) 269-335.

[132] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.7.

[133] As has been suggested by Bonner ((1977) 10). In this case, *πατρίος* would refer to the boy's ancestry in the most general terms; *LSJ* s.v. *πατρίος, -α, -ον*, II, and *παλαιός* to ages long past; *LSJ* s.v. *παλαιός, -ά, -όν*, II. One such story may well have been that of Manius Curius Dentatus whom we know Cato to have admired; see below p.196-7.

[134] *OLD* s.v. *mos, moris,* 2.b.

Licinianus' own family line, featured prominently within the accounts of the *Historia*. Indeed, it is likely that the *Historia* focused on the achievements of Cato's family over and above the traditional stories of Rome's republican past. This would set the *Historia* in the same historiographical patterning as Cato's *Origines*, which also does not appear to have treated the traditional stories of the Roman Republic, but rather narrated the life and customs of Italian cities more latterly allied to Rome.[135] The prominence given to the Porcii within the *Historia* would certainly sit well within Cato's wider works, which display strong autobiographical tendencies;[136] and with the pattern of most historiographical works written in the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC, in which authors would typically magnify the achievements of their own *gens* within the story of the Rome.[137] In fact, it is tempting to read Plutarch's description of the *Historia* as *τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ πατρίων* with the biographer's earlier comments about Cato's remarks on his family history:[138]

*τῶν δὲ προγόνων παντάπασιν ἀγνώστων γεγονέναι δοκούντων αὐτὸς ὁ* Κάτων *καὶ τὸν πατέρα* Μᾶρκον *ὡς ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα καὶ στρατιωτικὸν ἐπαινεῖ, καὶ* Κᾶτωνα *τὸν πρόπαππον ἀριστείων πολλάκις τυχεῖν φησι καὶ πέντε πολεμιστὰς ἵππους ἐν μάχαις ἀποβαλόντα τὴν τιμὴν ἀπολαβεῖν ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου δι' ἀνδραγαθίαν.*

[135] On the *Origines*' avoidance of the early republican period and promotion of Italian cities, see Cornell (1972). It is perhaps significant that Cato also emphasised his own Italian origins; while Cato's recorded home town of Tusculum was probably the first *municipium* to be granted Roman citizenship in 381 (on the longstanding citizenship of the Porcii, see Astin (1972)), the Censor choose to stress his non-Roman and non-urban connections, setting his description of his youth instead in upland Sabine territory. While as an equestrian family, the Porcii probably had several estates and Cato was likely to have spent time on more than one of them, it is notable that the Sabine territory in which he chose to set his youth was more remote from Rome geographically, harsher in terrain, and had been much more recently enfranchised (290), than his primary residence at Tusculum; see *ORF*[3] 128 with discussion below p.193-7.

[136] That many of Cato's didactic works derived from his own personal experience has already been established; the titles of Cato's speeches also signal their heavy use of his own example and experiences – *De consulatu suo*, *De suis virtutibus*, *De sumpto suo*; autobiographical elements have also been noted within the *Origines*, see above p.25, p.29.

[137] On the autobiographical elements of early Roman historiography, see Cornell (2009) 15-40; on the autobiographical elements of Cato's *Origines*, in particular, as competitive and politically motivated, see Gotter (2009) 108-22.

[138] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 1.1.

While his ancestors are generally regarded as without distinction, Cato himself lauds his father Marcus as a fine man and an excellent commander, and he claims that his great-grandfather Cato often won prizes for bravery and that on the five occasions when his charger was killed beneath him in battle he was rewarded with their value from the public treasury because of his valour.

The stories detailed in these lines which Cato told about the military achievements of his father and great-grandfather would provide perfect material for the *Historia*; displaying the virtue of his ancestors, embodied in their courageous actions, as part of significant military events in Rome's history.[139] These tales would also hold the attention of a young child well; in particular, the story of his great-great-grandfather's loss of five horses in battle would have the human interest necessary to capture a child's imagination, and its repetitive nature would help to facilitate learning. The *Historia*, then, represents the very beginnings both of Licinianus' literate education and of his inculculation of Roman values through tales of the virtue displayed, above all, by his own ancestors.

Indeed, the role of the *Historia* to educate Licinianus in the achievements of his ancestors connects Cato's work with some of the functions of the of the *imagines maiorum* found in aristocratic households.[140] These wax masks and their accompanying inscriptions, displayed in the *atria* of aristocratic houses, served not only to impress visitors as they entered the house, but they also had an important didactic function in instructing the children of the

[139] The *Historia* appears to have been a work designed to develop Licinianus' moral values as much as to further his knowledge of Rome's history; indeed, since Roman history and Roman ideas of virtue were both based upon military endeavour, any work narrating Rome's history must naturally offer instruction in both. This symbiosis is neatly paralleled in Plutarch's language at this point. The verb which Plutarch uses to describe the benefit Licinianus received from the *Historia* comes from a military context appropriate to the types of stories likely to be contained in the work; Plutarch uses ὠφελέω just a few chapters earlier to describe Cato's enriching his soldiers as a general (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 10.4).
[140] On the other functions of these masks, see Flower (2009b) 70-2.

household in the achievements of their ancestors.[141] Notably, those citizens who did not have their own *imagines maiorum*, readily created alternatives to the waxen masks; Marius' rhetoric depicted his battle-scars as his *imagines*, since they, too, demonstrated his virtue;[142] freedmen from the late Republic created busts of their own children as though they were *imagines*, projecting their family line into the future, in the absence of an illustrious past.[143] Amidst this range of recreated *imagines maiorum*, I would like to suggest that the *Historia* provided Cato with a textual alternative to the ancestor masks which the Porcii did not possess; the work is emphatically located by Plutarch within the home, it depicted the best of Cato's familial achievements, and, in the attention drawn to the work, it sought to advertise the Porcii's great deeds.[144]

It is clear, regardless of the exact content of the *Historia*, that the work should not be closely identified with the *Origines*. Scholars have been eager to see connections between the two works; some have identified the *Historia* as the *Origines*,[145] or as an early version of the work;[146] it has been suggested that the composition of the *Historia* was part of Cato's research for his later historical work;[147] and even that the work formed the first book of the

[141] Flower (1996) 220-1.
[142] Sall. *Iug*. 85.29. On the connection of such imagery to the popularised rherotic of the *novus homo*, see Wiseman (1971) 110-1; Leigh (1995).
[143] A particularly interesting example of this has been discovered in the tombs of several freedmen dated to the late republican period. These tombs are decorated with reliefs that feature the children of the deceased, in which they are depicted as *imagines maiorum*; see Dasen and Späth (2010) 135-136.
[144] Cato is eager not only to stress his family's status as equestrians (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 1.1), but also to uphold the standards of the class. As censor, his review of the equestrian ranks was harsh, depriving both L. Scipio Asiaticus (Livy 39.44.1) and L. Veturius (*ORF*$^{3}$ XII) of their horses. Cato's equestrian background, then, likely played an important part in his political strategy.
[145] This assimilation of the two works is largely based on the fact that Plutarch also uses ἱστορία to describe the *Origines* (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 25.1). However, the assimilation of the two works causes great difficulties due to the conflicting dates of their composition; the *Origines* is widely recognised as a work of Cato's old age, as Nepos testifies (Nep. *Cato* 3.3), and the *Historia*, as we have seen, must date from the early-to-mid 180s. Any direct assimilation between these two works is now broadly rejected (e.g. Peter (1914) I cxxix-cxxx; Marmorale (1949) 140-2; Chassignet (1986) ix).
[146] This view is now the consensus; see Sansone (1989) *ad* 20.7; Cornell (2013) 197. However, the exact nature of the connection between the two works, and the revisions which the *Historia* underwent cannot be pushed too far; for example, Jefferson's belief that the *Historia* was also aimed at an adult readership, which seems to rely on a rather close relationship between these works, is difficult to sustain (Jefferson (2012) 317).
[147] Kienast (1954) 107.

*Origines*.[148] While the *Historia* and the *Origines* are clearly connected by their shared historical subject matter and by their autobiographical approach to it, it is difficult to determine exactly whether, when, or by what process Cato could have developed the *Historia* into the *Origines*. It is perhaps wisest, therefore, simply to state the similarities between the two works and to avoid delving further into Cato's creative processes.

Plutarch also makes a point of mentioning that the *Historia* was written in Cato's 'own hand' (*ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ*).[149] This detail forms part of the emphasis which Plutarch, likely following Cato himself, gives to the Censor's significant personal involvement in the education of his son. It is possible that Cato's writing of the *Historia* by hand was in contrast to his normal practice of composition, which involved a scribe.[150] If this was, in fact, the case, then the father's efforts here are all the more emphatic. Cato's decision to write this text by hand may also have been motivated by a belief that his son, in reading his father's handwriting, would grow increasingly into his likeness, thus strengthening the connection between them.[151] The *Historia*, then, reflects the utmost of Cato's concern for his son's education and development.

Plutarch's account also suggests, as has been noted above, that while the *Historia* was unlikely to be circulated beyond Cato's household and extended family, the existence of the work was made public knowledge.[152] The biographer's claim that 'Cato himself says' he composed the history implies that Plutarch had read about the *Historia* in another of Cato's

[148] Dorey (1966) 34 n.44.
[149] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.7.
[150] *ORF*$^3$ 173, a passage of the *De Sumptu Suo*, is sometimes taken by scholars as a scene depicting Cato composing a speech by dictating to a scribe (Sciarrino (2011) 166-70; Astin (1978) 135-7, 202 n. 43). However, his interpretation of the fragment is not unanimous; Courtney, for example, sees this passage as a description of a courtroom scene ((1999) 88-90).
[151] This belief appears to be the motivation behind Augustus' insistence that his grandchildren imitate his own handwriting; see Suet. *Aug*. 64.3. However, it cannot be ruled out that Augustus' gesture was simply made in imitation of Cato's; see Wardle (2014) *ad loc.*
[152] See above p.24-5.

works.[153] It is possible that Cato referred to the *Historia* in the *Liber ad filium*, or in another of the works which he addressed to Licinianus, commenting on this area of his education.[154] The work may also have been mentioned in one of Cato's speeches; the extant fragments suggest that Cato often employed his own household as an example in his oratory, and that he spoke several times on the subject of education - Plutarch's knowledge of the work could easily have come from a speech of either sort.[155] Regardless of the particular work which mentioned the *Historia*, Cato's decision to advertise his involvement in his son's early instruction in traditional Roman values had clear political advantages; the *Historia* can be seen to emulate aristocratic practices, and to rival contemporary elite histories, publicising the achievements of the Porcii at a period which likely coincided with Cato's second campaign for the censorship.

The *Historia* has much to tell us about the relationship of Cato the Censor to his son. The work is important evidence for Cato's intimate involvement in the boy's instruction, for the traditional emphasis of that instruction, and for the prominent position of the Porcii within Cato's depiction of traditional Roman values. The *Historia* is also testament to the Censor's own literary creativity and development. The attention which Cato drew to the work strongly suggests that it engaged with the aristocratic ideals, historical works, and educational practices of his contemporaries, and that this engagement offered distinct political advantages.

### 2.5.2 *Liber ad filium*

[153] It is possible that this fragment comes from the preface to the *Historia*, but it is difficult to see why Plutarch would only have cited from this portion of the work, if he had the whole text.
[154] This is the view of Cornell, although he also allows that the *Historia* may have been mentioned in the preface to the *Origines*; see Cornell (2013) 197 n.14.
[155] For Cato's interest in educational matters, see below p.163-73.

***De medicina***

**F. 1** dicam de istis Graecis in suo loco, M. fili, quid Athenis exquisitum habeam et quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere. vincam nequissimum et indocile esse genus illorum, et hoc puta vatem dixisse: quandoque ista gens suas litteras dabit, omnia conrumpet, tum etiam magis, si medicos suos hoc mittet. iurarunt inter se barbaros necare omnes medicina, sed hoc ipsum mercede faciunt, ut fides is sit et facile disperdant. nos quoque dictitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios opicos appellatione foedant. interdixi tibi de medicis.

I will speak about those Greeks in their proper place, Marcus my son, on what I discovered at Athens and what good there is in inquiring into, not acquiring full knowledge of their learning. I shall demonstrate that their race is utterly worthless and impossible to improve, and consider a prophet to have said this: when that nation gives us its learning, it will corrupt everything, then even more so, if it sends here its doctors. They are in a conspiracy to kill all barbarians with their healing art, and what's more, they do this very thing for a fee, so that they can be trusted and can destroy us easily. They are also in the habit of calling us barbarians and they besmirch us, more foully than others, with the name 'Opici'. I have prohibited you from having dealings with doctors.

Plin. *HN* 29.14

*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F1 J. = *ad Filium Marcum* F1 C. = *ELM* F10

Pliny opens the twenty-ninth book of his *Natural History* with an account of the history of medicine in the Mediterranean.[156] Starting from Aesculapius' resurrection of Tyndareus from the dead, Pliny traces the development of the medical profession and the concomitant rise in prices for medical treatment in the Greek world.[157] Pliny then moves on to describe the arrival of the first Greek doctor in Rome and the widespread antipathy towards the medical

[156] Pliny introduces the discussion as 'on the art of medicine itself' (*de ipsa medendi arte*); Plin. *HN* 29.1.
[157] Plin. *HN* 29.1-11.

profession that his practice raised.[158] He cites these lines of Cato, then, as a single opinion to summarise the sentiments of the citizens of his day on the subject of Greek medicine.[159] Pliny returns to Cato's views at several points in his ensuing discussion; both qualifying and expanding the Censor's opinion as he adds his own condemnation of the medical profession. These lines are also cited in very similar terms by Cato's biographer Plutarch, whose account of them, and its differences from Pliny's, is discussed below.[160]

This fragment is routinely placed first in editions of Cato's *Liber ad filium*.[161] While it is unlikely that these formed the work's opening lines, they display a variety of prefatory elements, indicating that they form part of an introduction of some kind. The strong sense of Cato's presence, the prominent address to his son, the reference made to the work's wider content, and the exaggerated, polemical attitudes found here, can all be identified as elements typically associated with the preface.[162] The tone of these lines is, in fact, rather different from the prosaic and practical directions which make up many of the remaining fragments attributed to the *Liber ad filium*; it is possible, then, that this prefatory section was a later addition, polishing a private and practically oriented work for publication.[163] We cannot ascertain whether these lines prefaced simply the medical section of the *Liber ad filium*, or

[158] Archagathus, a wound specialist, was initially welcomed by the Romans upon his arrival to the city in 219; however, after a short time, his invasive surgical and cauteristic practices (*saevitia secandi urendique*) earned him the nickname of 'executioner' (*carnifex*); Plin. *HN* 29.12-3.
[159] Pliny quotes these lines of Cato directly, claiming that the Censor's personality, which for Pliny is the source of his authority, can be found in 'his very words' (*verba eius ipsa*); Plin. *HN* 29.13.
[160] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 23.2-4.
[161] It holds this position in the editions of Jordan (1860) and of Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001).
[162] Several of these elements can be paralleled in Cato's wider works; the Censor opens his speech *Pro Rhodiensibus* with a similarly emphatic use of the first person (*ORF*$^{3}$ XLII); the opening of the *De agricultura* features polemical attitudes expressed against non-agricultural means of making money (*Agr. praef.* 1); while the opening of the *Origines* makes clear indications as to the work's wider content (F1 *FRHist.*); the strong presence of an addressee, found both here and in several later fragments (F 6 and 18) is unique to the *Liber ad filium* amongst Cato's works, but is widely found in prefatory material more generally.
[163] The preface to the *De agricultura* certainly has the appearence of being a piece of polish applied to a private, practical document, and it is not unreasonable to assume a similar composition process for the *Liber ad Filium*; this preface thus would have been added as part of the revision and reorientation of Cato's teaching notes for a wider audience.

were part of the preface to the work as a whole.[164] There are too many unknowns about the exact form, structure, and manner of circulation of the *Liber ad filium* to hope to answer this question; however, in the absence of any other prefatory fragments of a more substantial size, or a more general bent, I have positioned these lines as first within the medical section of the *Liber*, and have placed that section at the start of the work.[165] While there are very good grounds to hold that this fragment forms an introductory passage, beyond that I do not wish to speculate.

These lines' opening address to Licinianus, 'Marcus my son' (*Marce fili*), and the repetition of that address at several later points within the *Liber ad filium*, has proved to be one of the work's most distinctive features.[166] This address is likely to reflect something of the original function of the *Liber*'s contents as part of Licinianus' practical instruction at the hands of his father.[167] Cato's use of the appellation here is a direct recollection of that verbal instruction, the vocative vividly recreating a conversational setting in which the substance of the work can be delivered.[168] The advice given in the *Liber ad filium* would have been an essential part of Licinianus' instruction in household management and the *Liber* itself would provide a useful reference work for those teachings. The prominence of the *Liber*'s address to Licinianus also provides several other advantages. On the work's circulation within a wider audience, the setting of its instruction within a paternal relationship would confer a singular

[164] On the three different topics of the *Liber ad filium* and the sections which they are traditionally divided into, see below p.126-7.
[165] Although Cato's command, forbidding Licinianus to consult medical professionals, is clearly closural and suggests that these lines formed the conclusion, rather than the opening, of a preface.
[166] The appellation 'to my son' (*ad filium*) is added to almost every citation from the *Liber* (Fs 1, 3-7, 11, 13, 17-8).
[167] Indeed, Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi read these lines very closely with Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.6 ((2001) *ad loc*.).
[168] Cato's use of the vocative as he initiates this conversation, and similarly his use of the future, *vincam*, as he charts its course, can be profitably linked to Volk's notion of 'poetic simultaneity', a conceit in which a text comes into being only as it evolves, which she connects with didactic poetry (Volk (2002) 6-24).

authority upon its author, promoting the potency of his work.[169] The *Liber ad Filium*'s addressee also serves to distinguish this text from Cato's other didactic works, many of which have similar content; this designation may have been Cato's intent within his use of an addressee and would certainly be of value to his readers and editors.[170] A wide variety of generic implications have also been read into the prominent presence of the addressee within these lines. The address has led some scholars to attribute this fragment to the *Epistulae*, as well as to a variety of readings of the *Liber ad filium* as a letter, or series of letters.[171] It has also led some to connect this fragment with the epistolary preface so prominent in later literature, and to strengthen the idea of the *Liber* as a technical didactic treatise.[172] However, I find it difficult to read this address as a demonstration of generic affiliation on Cato's part; these prominent addresses to Licinianus surely arise from the *Liber*'s derivation from a piece of oral instruction; then, finding clear purpose in the work's wider cirulation as a claim to paternal authority, the address remains as an element of the polish added at strategic points of the text. While later readers of the *Liber ad filium* may have taken this address as a signal of the text's didactic or epistolary affiliations, and as something to be imitated in this, it is difficult to argue that Cato was able to separate his text from its original context in quite the same way.

These lines have often been cited as an example of Cato's anti-Hellenism at its most pronounced.[173] Here Cato denounces the entire Greek race as 'utterly worthless and

[169] On Cato's use of his paternal authority within his public career, see below, p.180-92. On paternal authority within the Roman worldview more generally, see Harris (1986); on paternal authority used to enhance efficacy by didactic writers, see LeMoine (1991).
[170] The *De agricultura* and the *De Medicina* both treated similar subjects to the *Liber ad Filium*.
[171] Leo (1913) 279 n.1 has these lines as an epistolary fragment and Cugusi places it within the *ELM* (although Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi later move these lines into the *Liber ad filium* in the *Opere*). I find it difficult to view these lines as part of a letter of Cato, as the context in which they are cited by both Pliny and Plutarch comes within wider material which derives directly from the *Liber ad filium.*
[172] On these readings of the *Liber*, see below p.128-31.
[173] The sentiment of these lines is the most difficult to work into Gruen's rationalised and moderate account of Cato's anti-Hellenism, see Gruen (1992) 75-6.

impossible to improve,' (*nequissimum et indocile*); he recommends an acquaintance with Greek learning, 'inquiring into, not acquiring full knowledge of their learning,' (*illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere*), but ultimately fears its influence over Rome, 'when that nation gives us its learning, it will corrupt everything,' (*quandoque ista gens suas litteras dabit, omnia conrumpet*); Cato accuses Greek medical professionals of murderous, money-grubbing treachery, 'they are in a conspiracy to kill all barbarians with their healing art, and what's more, they do this very thing for a fee, so that they can be trusted and can destroy us easily,' (*iurarunt inter se barbaros necare omnes medicina, sed hoc ipsum mercede faciunt, ut fides is sit et facile disperdant*), and his condemnation of them is absolute, 'I have prohibited you from having dealings with doctors,' (*interdixi tibi de medicis*).[174] The sentiments expressed in these lines find less extreme parallels elsewhere in Cato's writings, which condemn certain Greek attitudes and ideas.[175] However, the anti-Hellenic stance signalled by some of these passages does not square with the majority of our evidence, which instead suggests that Cato was, like the rest of the Roman elite, familiar with the Greek language and had an appreciation for many aspects of Greek literature and culture.[176] It follows from these facts that the anti-Hellenic stance which Cato at times adopted, and of which these lines are a formidable example, must have been a pose which he took up at particular points for particular purposes.[177] The focus of discussion here will thus be the

[174] Plin. *HN* 29.14.

[175] Cato's condemnation of the Greeks is aimed particularly at their intellectual arts - rhetoric and philosophy (Rhetoric: Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 12.7, 23.2; Philosophy: Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 23.1; Gell. *NA* 18.7.3; Plin. *HN* 7.112; Cic. *Rep*. 3.9; Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 22); as well as some of their moral practices (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.7-8), and their system of governance (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 8.13). It is important to distinguish these specific causes for concern from Cato's more widespread condemnation of luxury (Polyb. 31.25.5a; Gell. *NA* 11.2.5; with discussion below p.186-9), and from the depictions of Cato as largely ignorant of Greek culture found in later authors (Cic. *Rep*. 5.2, *Acad*. 2.5, *Sen*. 3, 26; Nep. *Cato* 3.2; Val. Max. 8.7.1; Quint. *Inst*. 12.11.23; Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 2.5-6).

[176] Cato was fluent in Greek from an early age, having served in Southern Italy during the Second Punic War, as is confirmed by the reports of his pointed decision not to speak Greek to the Athenian assembly (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 12.5). Cato's familiarity with Greek language and culture is clear from the allusions we find in his written works, which display knowledge of Demosthenes, Homer, and Xenophon (Gruen (1992) 57-8), not to mention the reading of Greek historical works which informed the *Origines* (Cornell (1972)), and of Greek technical works which contribute to the *De agricultura* (Boscherini (1970)).

[177] On Cato's clever use of his anti-Hellenic stance within his relationships with the other members of Rome's ruling elite, and, in particular, within the sphere of elite competition over education, see below p.173-9.

content and context of these lines in particular, aiming to explain the extremity of the stance demonstrated in these lines within the wider purposes of the *Liber ad filium*.

The wider context in which Pliny cites this fragment of Cato's *Liber ad filium* does much to moderate the Censor's negative judgements on the Greek medical profession. Pliny claims that Cato's words give voice to a sentiment shared across Rome, in reaction to the city's first encounter with a foreign doctor, 'his [Archagathus'] name was changed to 'executioner' and his profession, along with all its practitioners, became an object of loathing, this fact is understood very clearly from Marcus Cato...,' (*transisse nomen in carnificem, et in taedium artem omnesque medicos, quod clarissime intellegi potest ex M. Catone*...);[178] Pliny also highlights that Cato's views were those of the senate, 'I will not abandon Cato, whom I have exposed to the ill will of so grasping a profession, or the senate which also judged likewise,' (*non deseram Catonem tam ambitiosae artis invidiae a me obiectum aut senatum illum qui ita censebat*);[179] as well as generations of later Romans, who did not hesitate to drive Greek doctors from the country, 'when, a long time after Cato, they expelled the Greeks from Italy they included the doctors,' (*cum Graecos Italia pellerent diu etiam post Catonem, excepisse medicos*);[180] finally, Pliny emphasises that he, too, shared these opinions, describing this negative judgement upon doctors as 'providence' (*providentiam*).[181] The Romans were not alone in their suspicion of and antipathy towards medical professionals. These opinions were shared by the Greeks themselves, who were inherently mistrustful of their own doctors.[182] Indeed, most peoples at most times have viewed medical treatment, and particularly novel or

[178] Plin. *HN*. 29.13.
[179] Plin. *HN* 29.20.
[180] Plin. *HN* 29.16. On the unusual use of *excepisse* here, see Jones (1963) *ad loc*.
[181] Plin. *HN* 29.16.
[182] The character of the bogus doctor was a common piece of fun for Greek New Comedy; *'Ιατρός* was the title of plays by Philemon, Theophilus, Aristophon, and Antiphanes; the doctor also featured in Menander's *Aspis*, where he is a ridiculous character - overly confident in his skill, unintelligible to the non-expert, and completely ineffectual (l.432-64). The doctor also featured in Plautine comedy, as the title character of the lost *Parasitus Medicus*, and in the *Menaechmi*, where he is similarly overblown and ineffectual (l.890-956); on Plautus' character, see Woytek (1982) 165-82.

unprecedented medical practices, with fear, suspicion, and hatred.[183] Cato's opinions, though expressed in strong terms, were certainly not out of step with those of his peers.[184]

Pliny is also eager to qualify what exactly it was about the medical profession of which Cato disapproved, suggesting several different elements about the practice of doctors which the Censor disliked. It is difficult to know whether or not Pliny derives these ideas on medicine directly from Cato himself; however, Pliny clearly felt that it was problematic for such a renowned Roman medical writer to declare an unqualified disapproval of the Greek art, and his willingness to modify and ameliorate these views is significant.

Pliny claims, then, that it is not medicine itself of which Cato and his contemporaries disapproved, but the professionalisation of this art and the prices charged for it; 'our forefathers did not condemn medicine itself, but its trade; they objected deeply to making a livelihood from payments sourced from a man's life,' (*non rem antiqui damnabant, sed artem; maxime vero quaestum esse manipretio vitae recusabant*).[185] The concerns which Pliny notes here certainly chime with Cato's indignation at being treated, and potentially injured or killed by doctors, 'for a fee,' (*mercede*).[186] Pliny's claims that these fees and price fixes continued to grow greater than Cato could have imagined attests further to the Censor's good judgement in his early condemnation of the medical profession.[187]

[183] Von Staden (1996) 369-418.
[184] Cato is even able to call upon the caricature of the quack in his speech *Si Se M. Caelius Tribunus Plebis Appellasset*, relying upon his audience's shared negative sentiments towards such doctors (*ORF*[3] 111).
[185] Plin. *HN* 29.16.
[186] Plin. *HN* 29.14.
[187] Plin. *HN* 29.24.

Further to these problems with pricing, Pliny holds that the Censor's greatest reservation about medicine was the wider beliefs and attitudes to health and to the body promoted within medical writings. Cato feared the potential for moral corruption implicit within these attitudes (*illa... timuit Cato atque providit*); these fears, so Pliny claims, were well justified 'those practices ruined the morals of the realm,' *(illa perdidere imperii mores*).[188] Pliny lists some of the attitudes and practices of which Cato disapproved. These include the use of wrestlers' ointment and hot baths for the healthy, and for the sick, the consumption of strong medication, hair removal, and female nudity.[189] The practices highlighted here all indicate a disposition towards luxury, extreme dieting, or sexual immorality - all vices which were regularly condemned by Cato.[190] Recalling the words of the Censor in this fragment, Pliny then goes on to state that, 'so indeed it is the case: the corruption of our morals, more than from anything else, is due to medicine, daily proving Cato a prophet and an oracle: it is enough to inquire into, not acquire full knowledge of the ideas of the Greeks,' *(ita est profecto: lues morum, nec aliunde maior quam e medicina, vatem prorsus cottidie facit Catonem et oraculum: satis esse ingenia Graecorum inspicere, non perdiscere*).[191] These lines indicate clearly that, for Pliny, the *litterae* which Cato warned his audience from were composed of medical treatises, which ought to be consulted discerningly – avoiding immoral attitudes and practices such as those listed above - rather than followed exhaustively.[192] Here Pliny upholds, once again, Cato's judgements against medicine; furthermore, his description of Cato's particular objections within the sphere of medicine does much to nuance the

[188] Plin. *HN* 29.26.
[189] Plin. *HN* 29.26.
[190] On Cato's disapproval of nude bathing, see Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.7-8; on fasting, see Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23.5; on luxury, see Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 16.7.
[191] Plin. *HN* 29.27.
[192] See also Boscherini (1970) 21-2. While Pliny interprets these *litteras* as a reference strictly to medical treatises, Plutarch expands the scope of the texts which Cato condemns dramatically, connecting these *litteras* to Greek culture in its widest sense, and within that, particularly to philosophy (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23.2). It is probable that this expanded application of *litteras* is Plutarch's creation, as he seeks to make an example of Cato's rejection of a Greek literary education and its negative consequences. On Plutarch's interest in education, see Swain (1990).

Censor's apparent blanket condemnation of Greek doctors.[193] It was not their science which Cato disapproved of, but the price paid for their treatments, as well as the values entrenched in their medical literature, hence the need to pick and choose the texts that one read.

It is sensible, therefore, to set this fragment within the wider context, provided by Pliny, of the Romans' general antipathy towards Greek medicine. This context suggests Cato's views were neither unusual nor out of the ordinary, and that we ought not to interpret them as an overly harsh condemnation either of the Greeks, or of their medical arts. It is also useful to consider the careful qualifications which Pliny appends to Cato's disapproval of Greek doctors: his dislike of their high prices and of the poor moral values implicitly embodied in their treatments and treatises. This reasoning is closely connected with the words of this fragment, the judgement of which, thus rationalised, Pliny is eager to uphold.

It is also important to view the claims of this fragment within the context of Cato's *Liber ad filium*. As part of the work's preface, these lines are naturally a piece of hyperbole and high rhetoric, deliberately crafted and designed to promote the work that they introduce and its author. Indeed, the clear condemnation of Greek medical professionals in these lines highlights the need for an alternative method of treating the sick, which the *Liber ad filium* can then fulfil. In particular, Cato's criticisms of Greek medical literature as a resource limited value (*et quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere*), create the need

[193] The emphasis of Cato's condemnation instead falls upon certain immoralities that he saw within the Greek lifestyle, which were particularly dangerous to the public when they came to be preached as part of medical cures; hence Cato's denunciation of the Greeks as 'utterly worthless and impossible to improve,' (*nequissimum et indocile*), appears to be concerned with the common stereotype of the immoral Greeks only in combination with their medical practitioners and to be concerned with their medical practictioners only in relation to these immoral practices (Plin. *HN* 29.14).

for work on medicine by a Roman author, which he goes on to provide us in the *Liber*.[194] If the treatments administered by Greek doctors are expensive, dangerous, and morally damaging, Cato's prescriptions, by implied contrast, are heralded as inexpensive, effective, and upright. Similarly, Cato himself becomes, by comparison with professional medical men, honest and morally sound. The hyperbole of these lines, then, appears as much about the promotion of the Censor and this work, as it is about a negative judgement on the Greeks. It is likely that these particular, pragmatic aims were Cato's overriding concern in crafting these lines, rather than any deep-felt sense of anti-Hellenism.

Cato's inclusion of his family – both his son Licinianus who is addressed here and his wife who is mentioned in the following fragment - within the opening lines of the *Liber ad filium*, furthers this impression of honesty and integrity, demonstrating that Cato uses these treatments himself and offering his own household as proof of their effectiveness. Indeed, the prominent inclusion of Cato's family here confirms the true place of medicine within Roman society; as part of the duties of the *pater familias*, not as a professional service provided by an individual foreign to the home. It has been noted that the other subjects definitely covered by the *Liber ad filium*, agriculture and rhetoric, were also areas managed by the *pater familias*, and it may well be that much of the antipathy expressed towards Greek doctors within these lines, and found in Cato's contemporaries, is derived from the challenge that these professionals posed to the self-sufficiency of the Roman household.[195] The *Liber ad filium*, then, fiercely defends that self-sufficiency, confirming Cato's own fidelity to these traditions and instructing his son in upholding them for the future.

[194] Plin. *HN* 29.14. The rhetorical strategy adopted by Cato here is not dissimilar to that of the *Origines*, which openly criticises the content of another form of historical writing, the *annales maximi*, in favour of Cato's own work; see F80 *FRHist*. with commentary *ad loc*. On the *annales maximi* more generally, see Frier (1999).

[195] Von Staden (1996) 382-6; Boscherini (1993) 730. While the engagement of the *Liber*, and of Cato's wider technical writing, with Greek treatises on these subjects, confirms that he saw the value of their knowledge, it does not imply an approval of the attitudes and values which informed it.

When read within their context not only within Pliny's citation, but also within their original setting in the *Liber ad filium*, it becomes apparent that much of the hyperbole in these lines in simply rhetorical; strongly associated with the preface and clearly aimed at promoting the *Liber* and its author.

The tone of these lines is highly authoritative, as Cato asserts his power and privilege to instruct, underlining the potency of the directions given in his work. This impression of authority is created in several ways, most notably through the oracular pose which the Censor adopts here, 'and consider a prophet to have said this,' (*et hoc puta vatem dixisse*).[196] This claim to speak with divine authority is one to which Cato returns later in the *Liber ad filium*. Pliny describes Cato's advice on keeping active 'as from some kind of oracle,' (*ut ex oraculo aliquo*);[197] and, by analogy with the current fragment, it seems probable that this comparison arose in the words of Cato's text, rather than from Pliny's judgement.[198] Horace also cites a pronouncement of the Censor's on the positive decision of a young man to sate his lust in a brothel as a 'divine belief of Cato,' (*sententia dia Catonis*),[199] in lines which may well derive from the *Liber ad filium*.[200] In these claims to divine authority, Cato presents himself as a traditional source of medical advice. Oracles were often consulted for guidance on how to relieve a particular ailment; indeed, Pliny observes that the medical arts were not only divine

[196] Plin. *HN* 29.14.
[197] Plin. *HN* 7.171.
[198] Columella also cites Cato as an oracle on the dangers of inactivity; 'for that oracular statement of Marcus Cato is true: by doing nothing men learn to do no good,' (*nam illud verum est M. Catonis oraculum: nihil agendo homines male agere discunt*), in a passage which may well derive from the same portion of the *Liber ad filium* as these lines of Pliny (Columella, *Rust.* 11.1.26).
[199] Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.32-3.
[200] The youthful addressee of these lines, their claim to divinity, and their description of his lustful state in such medical terms as 'foul lust swelled his veins,' (*venas inflavit taetra libido*), suggest that this utterance could well originate from the *Liber*; although concrete proof is, of course, an impossibility (Gowers, for example, traces these lines to a collection of sayings ((2012) *ad loc.*)).

in origin, but were also often still directed by divine utterance, 'even today in many places no small amount of treatment is sought from oracles,' (*nec non et hodie multifariam ab oraculis medicina petitur*).[201] Cato's claims to pronounce divine sentiment in these lines thus adds particular authority to his medical prescriptions, championing these rustic remedies over the artistry of Greek doctors, who are wholly denounced.[202]

The authority of Cato's denunciation of foreign medical professionals, and the implicit promotion of his own curative skills, derives not only from the realm of religion, but also from the political sphere. In his denigration of the Greek race, Cato calls upon his own experience of the people whilst he served as a military tribune in Athens as evidence;[203] 'I will speak about those Greeks in their proper place, Marcus my son, on what I discovered at Athens...' (*dicam de istis Graecis in suo loco, M. fili, quid Athenis exquisitum habeam...*).[204] Cato thus calls upon his official observations to reinforce his views. It is not only the experience gained as a magistrate which lends authority to Cato's views, but also the magisterial language in which they are expressed. Cato' uses the verb *dico, -ere*, later reinforced by the compound *interdico, -ere* to make his denunciation of the Greeks, making use of the same verb which a magistrate would use to give public pronouncements and statements to give his own personal judgement on the Greeks.[205] The use of these verbs underlines the authority of Cato as their author, while the performative aspect of his words,

[201] Plin. *HN* 29.3.
[202] Several later sources refer to Cato as a source of divine wisdom in other contexts; Gellius, for example, describes his speech *De Rhodiensibus* as a 'remarkable and almost inspired manner of refutation,' (*mirifica et prope divina responsionis figura*), Gell. *NA* 6.3.48; Valerius Maximus also states that Cato had become the byword for an 'upright and excellent citizen,' (*sanctum et egregium civem*), Val. Max. 2.10.8. It is possible, then, that Cato made use of this claim to oracular authority beyond the realm of medicine.
[203] On the discrepancies over the exact position held by Cato, see Astin (1978) 56 n.15.
[204] Plin. *HN* 29.14.
[205] On the use of *dico, -ere* and its compounds by magistrates to prescribe, appoint, and declare, see e.g. XII Tables I.8, IX.3; *OLD* s.v. *dico, -ere*, 10 a-c.

used to effect important actions within the Roman world, emphasises the effect of Cato's text and the prescriptions detailed within it, too.[206]

The terms of Cato's judgement are also reminiscent of official language, with repeated instances of alliteration bimembre, *medicos... mittet, alios... appellatione*, which is typically associated with the earliest legal and religious language, and increasingly by Cato's time, with attempts to mark language as of a higher register, and even with alliteration trimembre in f, that most unappealing of letter sounds, *faciunt... fides... facile*.[207] It appears that in these lines Cato was 'seeking to write impressively,' using magisterial terminology and literary techniques commonly found in higher register legal and religious texts.[208] The use of this language increased the authority of the pronouncements made in these lines.

In combination with this very public form of authority, Cato also appealed to the private authority of the *pater*, a figure with full jurisdiction over his household, in his address of these lines to his son, 'Marcus my son,' (*Marce fili*).[209] The oracular tones of these lines would be wholly appropriate for a father to dictate to his son, reflecting the religious and legal authority which the head of the household held over its members.[210] This fragment is thus rooted in Cato's public authority, recalling his time as military tribune, making

[206] Sciarrino (2011) 10-2.
[207] Alliteration of this sort abounds in the XII Tables (e.g. I.4, I.7, III.1, VIII.1a, VIII.12, VIII.21, X.5a, XII.2a) and is found in early *carmina* (Cato, Agr. 141.2-3). It frequently appears in Plautine cantica, which are widely associated with higher-register features, and is often found at the end of lines, a position associated with high-register archaism (e.g. *Men*. 572, 966, 967). On the phenomenon of alliteration bimembre, see Clackson and Horrocks (2007) 160-4; Palmer (1954) 85-8, 104-5, 108-9, 122. On register and archaism in Plautus, see de Melo (2007) 6-11, 226, 247. On Cato's language and use of such literary techniques more generally, see Briscoe (2005), (2010); Cornell (2013) 23-5. On the unpleasant sound of the letter F to the Roman ear, see Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.28-9.
[208] Cornell (2013) 25.
[209] Plin. *HN* 29.14.
[210] See Harris (1986).

pronouncements as those in office, and employing the official language of Roman politics; yet it is addressed, in tender terms, to his son, a private member of his household. This parallelism reinforces the absence of distinction felt between the public and private lives of the Roman elite. It is also a parallelism that lies at the heart of the works which Cato wrote for his son and at the centre of the role that this relationship had in his political career: these texts are practical and private documents, but they are ones to which we can and should ascribe public access and wider purposes.

In the final lines of this fragment, Cato accuses the Greeks of calling the Romans not only by the derogatory term of *barbari*, but even by that of *Opici*; 'they are also in the habit of calling us barbarians and they besmirch us, more foully than others, with the name 'Opici',' (*nos quoque dictitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios opicos appellatione foedant*). This statement makes clear to Cato's audience that the Romans are included amongst those barbarous groups that the Greek doctors have sworn to kill. It also notes that the Greeks not only term them *barbari*, but also *Opici*, a name which Cato feels is unfairly attributed to them.[211] The name Opici was used by Greek historians – whose work Cato knew well - to describe the peoples of central Italy, including the Romans.[212] Here, Cato is keen to assert a distinction, not recognised by the Greeks, between the Romans and the rest of these peoples, whom he deems to be less-cultured than the Romans themselves.[213] This assertation fits well within the wider context of Roman claims to share in Greek cultural sophistication over and

[211] The Romans do not appear to have been uncomfortable with their designation as *barbari*; the Mamertines can successfully appeal to the Romans for aid as fellow barbarians (Polyb. 1.50); and Plautus can use the appellation in his proud claims about his translation skills, 'Maccus translated it into barbarian language,' (*Maccus vortit barbare*); *Asin.* 11 (all translations from Plautus are those of de Melo, whose rendering of Plautine Latin I cannot hope to surpass). Indeed, the image may have held much positive potential, establishing the Romans as a people in opposition to the more negative aspects of Greek culture.

[212] 'For all practical purposes this means the immediate (Oscan) neighbours of the Greek cities, the Etruscans, and, after the middle of the fourth century, the Romans,' (Cornell (1972) 162).

[213] On the Greek writers' lack of interest in distinguishing amonst Italian peoples, see Dench (1995) 52.

above their uncouth Italic neighbours.[214] It is notable that Cato's contemporary Ennius uses the Oscan's native term for himself, *Opscus*, rather than the Latin form, in his *Annales*, a decision which seems designed to highlight the foreignness of the Oscans.[215] The conclusion of this 'developing tradition of Oscan inferiority' is the use of the term in later Latin simply to mean 'ignorant'.[216] This negative judgement on a neighbouring Italian people finds parallel in Cato's *Origines* and the opinion expressed here may have been formed by Cato's research for his historical work.[217] There is certainly evidence to suggest that Rome's cultural superiority to the Oscan peoples may even have been felt by the Oscans themselves.[218] It is also possible that Cato's dislike of the Oscans had a personal level; it is easy to imagine that the lewd dramatic form of Atellan farce earned his moral disapproval, and the Opici's support for Hannibal during his occupation of Southern Italy, a campaign in which Cato himself was involved, cannot have lessened his dislike of the people. However, in the context of this heavily rhetorical passage and its role as a preface to Cato's literary work, it seems correct to focus on the discussion of culture, implicit within the terms *Graeci*, *Barbari*, and *Opici*, that Cato raises here. Cato's claim for the clear cultural inferiority of the Oscans, and, further to this, his questioning of the Greeks' cultural superiority (on the basis of their failure to understand the differences between the people groups of central Italy), both explicitly and implicity asserts the Romans, by contrast, as a people of culture.[219] Cato's choice to preface his work with an assertion of Roman cultural superiority strongly suggests that he saw

[214] As part of these claims for their phil-Hellenism, the Romans thus also played into Greek fears about Oscan influence in their cities (Thuc. 6.2.4).
[215] Enn. *Ann*. 291 Sk. The Latinate *Oscus* is found in Ennius' proud description of his mixed heritage (*Ann*. i Sk.), a decision which is possibly motivated by his now naturalised state (*Ann*. 525 Sk.). Other Italic peoples come under attack for their unsophisticated rustic ways in contemporary Roman comedy; the Praenestines (Plaut. *Bacch*. 12; *Capt*. 884; *Truculentus* 688-91; Naev. 21-4 *CRF*$^{3}$ Ribbeck); the Apulians (Plaut. *Mil*. 648); and the inhabitants of Pistoriae (Plaut. *Capt*. 160-4).
[216] Dench (1995) 77. On this use of Opici, see *TLL* s.v. *Opicus, -a, -um*, 9.2.702.80.
[217] Cato terms the Ligurians, for example, as liars (F34a *FRHist*.).
[218] This much is indicated by the Cumaeans' request to the senate for permission to use Latin rather than Oscan for public business, seeking to trade on the prestige of the language as one of a culture and authority above their own; see Livy 40.43.1 with Adams (2003) 113-4, 122, 657-8.
[219] It is clearly impossible for Cato to claim Roman cultural superiority to the Greeks; however, he is emphatic in his declaration of the Romans' moral authority, and appears eager to shame the Greeks' cultural reputation, even if such shaming is only slight.

himself and his literary activities, represented here by the *Liber ad filium*, as an important part of Rome's growing cultural ambitions. This assertion then acts as a promotion of Cato's personal cultural credentials and technical skills, and claims potency for the prescriptions of work which followed.

**F. 2** subicit enim qua medicina se et coniugem usque ad longam senectam perduxerit, his ipsis scilicet quae nunc nos tractamus, profiteturque esse commentarium sibi, quo medeatur filio, servis, familiaribus, quem nos per genera usus sui digerimus.

For he adds with what treatment he brought both himself and his wife all the way to a lengthy old age, by these very practices, of course, with which I am now dealing, and he states that he has a collection of recipes, with which he treats his son, his slaves, and the members of his household, which I am arranging according to the forms of its use.

Plin. *HN* 29.15

*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F2 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F2 C.

Pliny cites these lines following on from his quotation of Cato's disavowal of Greek medical professionals (F1); Cato's refusal to rely on professional medicine was not the rejection of a 'very helpful service' (*rem utilissimam*), so Pliny claims, but his decision was justified by the alternative therapies which Cato supplied and was validated by the long life that he and his wife enjoyed as a result of those therapies.[220] Indeed, Pliny says that he knows and finds uses for many of the treatments documented in Cato's medical writings. Pliny's citation of these

[220] This boast of the length of his life and the promotion of the remedies which prolonged it are very likely taken by Pliny directly from the *Liber ad filium* in almost as many words (Plin. *HN* 29.15). This boast thus offers crucial evidence for the date of the work, which must have been circulated once Cato had reached an age where he could legitimately claim himself to be in old age. Such a point would likely be in the mid 170s, when Cato was around sixty years of age. On definitions of old age in the Roman world, see Parkin (2003) 15-35. For further discussion of the date of the *Liber*, see below p.124-6.

lines forms part of the broader background of the widespread and, to his mind, well-founded Roman resistance to Greek medicine which he has Cato's polemic represent.

These lines are also cited by Cato's biographer Plutarch, as part of his account of the Censor's dealings with the Athenian embassy and of Cato's views on the Greeks more generally.[221] Plutarch has a rather less positive picture to paint of Cato's renunciation of the Greek art in view of his own medical skills. As we find in Pliny, Plutarch also recalls Cato's mention of a collection of recipes: 'he states that there was a collection of recipes, that he had written himself, and to which he referred to treat and to minister to those of his household who were sick' (*αὐτῷ δὲ γεγραμμένον ὑπόμνημα εἶναι, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο θεραπεύειν καὶ διαιτᾶν τοὺς νοσοῦντας οἴκοι*);[222] Plutarch also has Cato claim to have extended his life by his own medical skills: 'Cato claims that it was by making use of such treatment and monitoring that he kept himself in good health and kept those under his care in good health,' (*τοιαύτῃ δὲ θεραπείᾳ καὶ διαίτῃ χρώμενος ὑγιαίνειν μὲν αὐτός, ὑγιαίνοντας δὲ τοὺς αὐτοῦ διαφυλάττειν*).[223] However, Plutarch is far less enthusiastic about the effectiveness of Cato's treatments, remarking, 'moreover, regarding this it appears that Cato did not avoid the wrath of heaven; for he lost both his wife and his son. Cato himself, kept in good health and vigour by his bodily constitution, steadily resisted the advances of old age for a long time.' (*καὶ περί γε τοῦτο φαίνεται γεγονὼς οὐκ ἀνεμέσητος· καὶ γὰρ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀπέβαλεν. αὐτὸς δὲ τῷ σώματι πρὸς εὐεξίαν καὶ ῥώμην ἀσφαλῶς πεπηγὼς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀντεῖχεν*). Here Plutarch prominently recalls the early deaths of Cato's wife and son and attributes the Censor's own longevity to nature, rather than nurture, putting down most effectively the

[221] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22; on the embassy, see below p.152-3, 171-2.
[222] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23.5.
[223] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23.6.

boasts with which he likely prefaced the *Liber ad filium*.[224] While there are certainly elements of national pride and personal dislike towards Cato which permeate Plutarch's words, they are, nevertheless, correct. Pliny's rather more positive view of the potency of Cato's remedies must surely be motivated by his commitment to his vision of homely Roman tradition triumphing over novel and subversive Greek artistry. The two accounts are thus wonderfully complementary.

This fragment appears to have come from the preface to the medical section of the *Liber ad filium*, where it may well have followed on directly, or almost directly, from the preceding fragment (F1).[225] These lines would work very well as the final part of the preface to this section. They clearly introduce the ensuing content of the work, allowing the reader to know what he might expect from this section of the *Liber*: 'for he has added with what treatment he brought both himself and his wife to a lengthy old age' (*subicit enim qua medicina se et coniugem usque ad longam senectam perduxerit*).[226] These lines also advertise the quality of this content, enticing the reader into the text; Cato's boast of his own and his wife's longevity here is not only a piece of classic self-promotion, but it also advertises the potency of the remedies and recipes which follow, capturing the audience's interest and attention at the start of this section. In addition, Cato's mention of his wider medical knowledge - 'he states that he has a collection of recipes, with which he treats his son, his slaves, and the members of his household' (*profiteturque esse commentarium sibi, quo medeatur filio, servis, familiaribus*) - has a similar effect, promoting the Censor's expertise and allowing him to present the remedies featured in the *Liber ad filium* as but a choice selection of that expert knowledge, a

[224] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 24.1. On Plutarch's impatience with Cato's hearty self-promotion more generally, see below p.142-3. In these lines the biographer even seems to suggest, with his use of *ἀνεμέσητος*, that for Cato to have made such claims for himself was hubristic behaviour.
[225] I take this to be the sense of *subicio, -icere* (*OLD* s.v. *subicio* 8 'to place immediately next or after').
[226] Plin. *HN* 29.15. Several of these treatments survive in our extants fragments (F3, 4, and 5).

further encouragement to his reader into the text that follows. This fragment thus acts as a fine preface to the following content of the medical section of the *Liber*.

The character of the *commentarius* which Cato claimed to possess is difficult to ascertain.[227] The sources' designation of it as a *commentarius*, or *ὑπόμνημα*, suggests a rough work, possibly no more than a collection of notes, and their failure to cite from it strongly suggests that it was unpublished, consulted mostly by Cato himself in the management of his private household.[228] Pliny's description of the work implies that its content was broadly similar to the medical advice offered in the *Liber ad filium*; however, the distinction which he draws between the remedies of the *commentarius*, used for the household as a whole, and those of the *Liber ad filium*, with which Cato particularly treated himself and his wife, may suggest that the *commentarius* recommended treatments which were rather rougher and cheaper than those featured in the *Liber ad filium*. Pliny's claim to have reworked much of the material from Cato's *commentarius* into his own treatise (*quem nos per genera usus sui digerimus*) creates a problem. Pliny does not mention the *commentarius* at any other point within his *Natural History*, while the references which Pliny does make to Cato's medical expertise can all be traced to either the *Liber ad filium* or the *De agricultura*. This makes Pliny's claim to have the *commentarius* as one of his sources rather problematic. It is possible either that Pliny's reference to the *commentarius* in these lines is actually a reference to the medical section of the *De agricultura*, which he dubs as a *commentarius* here, or that Pliny had a separate work of Cato's known as a *commentarius*, but that this work shared very similar

[227] The sources are uncertain as to whether Cato composed the work himself, or simply that he possessed such a document and made use of it; Pliny's account states that Cato owned such a work (Plin. *HN* 29.15), but Plutarch goes further and says that Cato wrote it himself (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23.5). The truth is likely somewhere between these two positions; i.e. that Cato compiled the work using a variety of different sources, which were supplemented by his own practical experience. It is possible that Plutarch wishes to present the *commentarius* as an erroneous production that was entirely Catonian, rather than admitting the possibility that it was Cato's sources – some of them Greek – who were in error.

[228] See above p.33-4.

content to the *De agricultura*, and hence none of his Catonian references can be clearly distinguished as from the *commentarius* rather than from his extant work. However, I believe that the most probable explanation for Pliny's apparent claim to have the *commentarius* amongst his sources is that the document which Cato himself referred to as a *commentarius* in the *Liber ad filium*, a relatively early work, later became the medical section of the *De agricultura*.[229] The connection between the two works would be an assumption on Pliny's part, but given how well the description of *commentarius* would fit the medical section of the *De agricultura*, it is certainly not a big one. The overall picture of the *commentarius* referred to in these lines, then, is of a rough set of household notes, composed of primary research and practical experience, which served as a source for the *De agricultura* and possibly for the *Liber ad filium*, and which was unlikely to have been produced or circulated as an independent work.

The boasts of this fragment, which the *commentarius* forms a crucial part of, are very typical both of Cato and of his prefatory style. Cato's reference to the *commentarius* demonstrates the potential that he saw for self-promotion within the production of the *Liber ad filium*. In addition to advertising the depth and breadth of his scientific knowledge, and thus promoting the *Liber* itself, this reference also drew further attention to Cato's wider literary skills and activities. This pattern of self-reference is found throughout Cato's work, and, as has been argued above, it strongly suggests that Cato took great pride in his literary works, that these works were available for wider consultation, and that he saw great potential for his literary activities to enhance his political career.

[229] On Cato's repetition of material between works, see above p.39 n.122.

**F. 3** lepus multum somni adfert, qui illum edit

Hare brings a deep sleep in the man who eats it.

Diom. 1. p.362. l.21ff K.
*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F3 J. = *ad Filium Marcum* F5 C.

Diomedes cites this line from Cato verbatim for the variant form *edit* used for the third person present singular active, *est*, as part of his discussion of the conjugation of the verb *edo, esse* – to eat. Diomedes indicates that this citation is taken from a work of Cato's 'to his son or on the orator' (*Cato ad filium vel de oratore*).[230] This appears to be a reference to the *Liber ad filium*; Diomedes, or his source,[231] has picked up on two of the work's salient points – its address to Cato's son, Licinianus, and its treatment of the topic of oratory.[232] Vahlen's conjecture of *aratore* for *oratore* is thus unnecessary, and, in any case, does not shed much light on a citation which treats a medicinal remedy. Diomedes' willingness to designate this fragment with a reference to another element of the *Liber ad filium* also provides persuasive evidence that the *Liber* was circulated, and certainly was later edited, as a single text composed on several subjects.

This line forms one of the few extant fragments which treat the medicinal remedies that must have made up the largest part of this first section of the *Liber ad filium*. It has been placed first of the remedies here by virtue of the fact that it is cited just after Fs 1 and 2 in one of our sources; however, this is certainly no guarantee as to its position within the text, and there is

[230] Diom. 1. p.362. l.21ff K.
[231] On the grammarians' frequent use of intermediary sources, see Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 31-3.
[232] It is the fragments of the *Liber ad filium* which treat oratory that are the most widely cited, and, it is Cato's pronouncement on the nature of the orator (F18) which is the most popular of these; it is therefore no surprise that Diomedes should take this subject as an identifier for the work.

no particular rationale by which it is possible to order Fs 3, 4, and 5. Pliny also cites Cato on the subject of the soporific properties of hare's meat;[233] and Plutarch gives an account of the qualities of hare which he integrates into his wider description of Cato's medical skills. It is worth quoting this passage in full:[234]

*αὐτῷ δὲ γεγραμμένον ὑπόμνημα εἶναι, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο θεραπεύειν καὶ διαιτᾶν τοὺς νοσοῦντας οἴκοι, νῆστιν μὲν οὐδέποτε διατηρῶν οὐδένα, τρέφων δὲ λαχάνοις καὶ σαρκιδίοις νήσσης ἢ φαβὸς ἢ λαγώ· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτον κοῦφον εἶναι καὶ πρόσφορον ἀσθενοῦσι, πλὴν ὅτι πολλὰ συμβαίνει τοῖς φαγοῦσιν ἐνυπνιάζεσθαι· τοιαύτῃ δὲ θεραπείᾳ καὶ διαίτῃ χρώμενος ὑγιαίνειν μὲν αὐτός, ὑγιαίνοντας δὲ τοὺς αὐτοῦ διαφυλάττειν.*

He states that there was a collection of recipes, that he had written himself, and to which he referred to treat and to minister to those of his household who were sick. He would never keep anyone fasting, but would feed them with vegetables and morsels of duck, pigeon, or hare's meat; for this is light and is suitable for those who are weak, save that it results in many dreams for those who eat it. Cato claims that it was making use of such treatment and monitoring that he kept himself in good health and kept those under his care in good health.

These lines place the description of the soporific properties of hare's meat within the wider context of foods which Cato recommended for those who were unwell, in preference to either their normal diet or a starvation diet.[235] It is unclear whether this treatment featured in the *commentarius* or the *Liber ad filium*; the phrasing in Plutarch could allow attribution of the prescription to either work, and, while the reference to this treatment in Diomedes clearly places it within the *Liber ad filium*, it is quite possible that he is in error. I would like to

[233] Plin. *HN* 28.260.
[234] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 23.5-6.
[235] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 23.6.

ascribe the prescription to the *Liber ad filium*: Plutarch does not clearly attribute the remedy to the *commentarius*, and the wider context of the Plutarchan passage, detailing Cato's claims to have prolonged the life of his family with these treatments, as well as the mention of the *commentarius* for the treatment of his household, must derive from the opening of the *Liber ad filium*, having close parallels in Pliny.[236] Indeed, the prescription may well follow on from Cato's opening polemic, personal boasts, and promotion of his wider works. Nonetheless, something of an ambiguity remains, but given that the *commentarius* was likely a source for the *Liber ad filium*, a misappropriation of content between them should not trouble us here.[237]

The dietary prescriptions given in these lines may well have formed the basis for many of the recipes found in this section of the *Liber ad filium*; the recommendation of a natural and non-invasive form of medical treatment has many parallels in the *De agricultura*;[238] while the suitability of hare's meat for those in a weakened state - a light-weight animal administered to those feeling light-headed - has all the hallmarks of traditional Roman medical thought.[239]

[236] Who clearly states that he has the *Liber ad filium* to hand as he works (*his ipsis scilicet quae nunc nos tractamus*); Plin. *HN* 29.15.

[237] Boscherini suggests, most plausibly, that the prescription on hare's meat featured in both works ((1993) 731). On the repetition of content between Cato's works, see above p.39 n.122.

[238] Many of Cato's treatments involve careful alterations in diet; he uses medicinal wine to treat a variety of ailments (*Agr*. 122-3, 125-7), cabbage water to treat indigestion (*Agr*. 156.1-4), colic (*Agr*. 156.5-6), and urinary tract infections (*Agr*. 156.7). He avoids more invasive treatments such as surgery even in extreme cases; for example, he lists a charm to cure a dislocation (*Agr*. 160). Indeed, it is probable that such avoidance of surgical, or other invasive prescriptions, in preference for such 'therapeutic' treatments was typical of traditional Roman medicine; it was, after all, Archagathus' aggressive approach to surgery and cautery that provoked such outcry at Rome (see Von Staden (1996) 373).

[239] Scarborough (1969) 19-21. The use of hare in prescriptions also appears in later Roman medical writers; most notably in pseudo-Pliny's *De Medicina*, where hare's meat, skin, bone, and internal organs are used to treat a wide variety of ailments (urinary incontinence: 2.19.2; colic: 2.8.6, 2.11.11; gall stones: 2.18.10; burns: 3.9.8; fever: 3.15.2; ulcers: 3.4.21; growths: 3.14.5); pseudo-Pliny also notes the soporific effect of hare, suggesting that the skin of a white hare – note the magical connotations of the colour - be placed under the patient's pillow to cure insomnia (3.19.4). Marcellus offers a slightly more limited range of prescriptions based around hare, which predominantly focus on digestive problems (26.125, 27.47, 29.35-6), but which also include eye problems (8.181), bruising (34.29-30) and ulcers (4.56). Marcellus' remedies with hare are all highly traditional. Hare is presented as a miracle cure all (26.109) and several treatments include magic elements: spells to say, the hare being untouched by a woman and not touched by the ground (29.35-6); a hare's ankle carried as a charm (27.84 and 28.48); an odd number of hares' stomachs used in a potion (27.47); hares' kidneys swallowed without them touching the patient's teeth (26.19). Anthimus' treatise *De Observatione Ciborum* also mentions hare as good to eat and excellent for treating dysentery and ear ache (13). Galen notes that hares can be used to treat incontinence (259 K), menstrual problems (334 K), and that its meat is nourishing (666 K.) and thickens

These words are thus likely to have formed part of a prescription of a particular diet, designed to relieve an ailment or affliction. This fragment offers a contrast in tone to the preceding ones. Overwhelmingly practical and prosaic, and with a notable absence of self-reference, these words must reflect the subject matter and style of the majority of the rest of this section of the *Liber ad filium*. This pattern of a high flown preface, followed immediately by more prosaic material is a familiar one from Cato's wider works, and was likely a regular feature of his authorial style.[240]

**F. 4** ex dolore, ex febri, ex siti, ex medicamentis bibendis, ex cataplasmatis, ex alvo lavando

from pain, from fever, from thirst, from drinking medicaments, from poultices, from purging the stomach

Prisc. *Inst.* 2. p.268 l.16ff K.
*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F4 J. = *Epistulae* F8 C. = *ELM* F8

Priscian cites these words of Cato on two occasions. The first, given above, is as part of the discussion of the gender of *alvus, -i* – stomach, which is properly feminine, but some early writers – including Cato in this fragment – treat as masculine (*veteres frequenter masculino genere protulerunt*).[241] Priscian attributes these words to a work of Cato's addressed to his son (*Cato ad filium*), which, given the medical content of the fragment, must surely designate the *Liber ad filium*. The second occasion for this quotation is as part of the grammarian's discussion of the formation of ablatives in 'i'.[242] In this instance, Priscian attributes these

the blood of the one who eats it (664 K.). These uses of hare as a cure all, and often in conjunction with magical elements, strongly suggests that it was a regular feature in traditional Roman medical treatments.
[240] Cf. *Agr. praef.* 1-4, *Agr.* 1-2.
[241] Prisc. *Inst.* 2. p.268 l.16ff K..
[242] Priscian does not recite the line in its entirety, but stops just short: *ex dolore, ex febri, ex siti, ex medicamentis bibendis* (Prisc. *Inst.* 2. p.337 l.5ff K.).

words to a letter of Cato, written to his son (*Cato in epistula ad filium*).[243] This has led some editors to see this fragment as from an individual letter to Licinianus, offering medical advice, rather than as part of the *Liber ad filium*.[244] While we know that Cato did address Licinianus in a series of letters,[245] at least some of which were available to Priscian's contemporaries,[246] this correspondence presents a military context throughout and appears to have been written to Licinianus whilst he served on campaign during the Third Macedonian War.[247] The clear medical content of this citation thus proves a better fit for the *Liber ad filium* than for the *Epistulae*. Furthermore, the clear epistolary colour of the *Liber ad filium*, and, in particular, the preface to this section on medicine, could well have led Priscian, or his source, to attribute this fragment to a work described as a letter.[248] Indeed, it is quite possible that the *Liber ad filium* came to be edited alongside the *Epistulae*. If Priscian had access to these works within a single volume, then this misattribution is most understandable.[249] It is, of course, impossible to rule out simple carelessness on Priscian's part.[250] While the possibility cannot be excluded that these words were, in fact, from a letter, they are a very apt fit for the medical section of the *Liber ad filium*. This fragment would likely form part of one of the remedies which Cato selected for this part of his treatise. Its list of three common symptoms of disease - pain, fever, and thirst - followed by three common treatments - medicinal solutions, poultices, and purging the bowels – may form a progressive description of a patient's symptoms and treatments, presumably before Cato then revealed the successful

[243] Prisc. *Inst*. 2. p.337 l.5ff K.
[244] So Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001) place this fragment amidst their *Epistulae* and it features in Cugusi's *ELM*.
[245] See below Fs 22-6.
[246] F24 = Diom. 1. p.366. l.9ff K.
[247] See below on Fs 21-6.
[248] Priscian himself notes the importance of a named addressee within correspondence and it is very possible that he has been led by Cato's opening addresse to Licinianus into terming this work as a letter (Prisc. *Inst*. 3. p.149 l.14ff K).
[249] On the idea of a collection of Cato's works and letters focussed upon his son, see below p.145-6.
[250] Notable, too, is the popularity of the form in late antiquity and tendency for writers of this period to describe all sorts of works as letters (Morello and Morrison (2007) 228).

remedy for treating one ailing in such a way.[251] The Graecism *cataplasma* is just one of the many Greek technical terms which we find throughout Cato's works.[252] Almost all of the symptoms and treatments mentioned are discussed in the *De agricultura,* providing further evidence for the strong connection between, and likely shared source of, these works.[253]

**F. 5** et cum innumerabilia sint mortis signa, salutis securitatisque nulla sunt, quippe cum censorius Cato ad filium de validis quoque observationem ut ex oraculo aliquo prodiderit, senilem iuventam praematurae mortis esse signum.

And although there are countless indicators of death, there are none of good health and a stable future, inasmuch as Cato the Censor transmitted to his son, as from some kind of oracle, the observation also with regard to the healthy, that an aged youth is an indicator of an early death.

Plin. *HN* 7.171

*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F5 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F6 C.

Pliny cites this observation of the Censor as part of his enumeration of the wide variety of signs which indicate that an individual's death is imminent. Pliny uses Cato's words to prove just how many and how diverse these indicators can be – the signs of death can even be found in those who are young and healthy.[254] These words are attributed by Pliny to a work of Cato's 'to his son' (*ad filium*), which strongly suggests that these lines – given not only their

[251] Although Boscherini has seen this fragment as from a general condemnation of doctors, with Cato listing the cures offered by such professionals alongside the troublesome symptoms ((1993) 730).
[252] Such Graecisms are a typical feature of Roman technical language across a range of subjects and are found at all stages of the Latin language. On Cicero's use of Greek terms in philosophy, rhetoric, and medicine, for example, see Adams (2003) 339-41. On Cato's use of Graecisms, see de Meo (1983) 50-4; Boscherini (1970) 93-122; Till (1935) 23-5. The term in question here, *cataplasma*, *-atis*, is a transliteration of the Greek, *κατάπλασμα*, *-ατος*. The absence of morphological defamation in this instance suggests that this was a high level borrowing, made by educated professionals, as we might expect of medical language.
[253] Cato, *Agr*. 156.5-6 (fever); 156.1-4, 114-5, 158 (purges); 122-3, 125-7 (medicinal wines).
[254] Plin. *HN* 7.171.

appellation of Licinianus, but also their medical subject matter - ought to be ascribed to the *Liber ad filium*.[255] Given Cato's emphasis on a vigorous and active lifestyle, it is most plausible that this observation was part of an admonition against young men being sedentary, secluded, or studying excessively.[256] Such an admonition might feature at any point within this part of the work, quite possibly in a final summary of general principles for good health, hence its position here.[257] Pliny's description of Cato's observation as 'from some kind of oracle' (*ex oraculo aliquo*), may reflect the fact that Cato prefaced these words directly with a declaration of their prophetic nature; however, it may be that Pliny reads this observation, and maybe even this entire section, as following on from the original claim to quasi-divine utterance made by Cato in the preface to this section of the *Liber ad filium*.[258]

There are two other fragments frequently attributed to the medical section of the *Liber ad filium* which are not featured in this edition. One of these fragments discusses the medicinal properties of cabbage, which, it claims, was the only medical treatment made use of by the Romans in the first six hundred years of the city's existence, prior to the arrival of Greek medical techniques in the late 3rd century BC.[259] This passage, from the *Medicinae ex Oleribus et Pomis* typically attributed to Gargilius Martialis, is paralleled in Pliny's *Natural*

[255] I take *de validis* with *observationem*, rather than with *ad filium* as a subject to qualify the topic on which Cato addressed his son; this is counter to the interpretation of several other descriptions of the *Liber ad filium* in our sources, but is surely correct in this case.
[256] On the moral value of activity, see Cato *ORF*$^{3}$ 128; Columella, *Rust.* 11.1.26; on the importance of being physically fit, see Cato *ORF*$^{3}$ 78-80, *Carmen de moribus* F1; on the pointlessness of excessive debate, see Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 9.2. Indeed, Cato appears to have been particularly fond of the adjective *strenuus, -a, -um*, to describe such an active attitude, particularly in battle; see *Agr. praef.* 4; *ORF*$^{3}$ 35; F76 *FRHist*. On the role of the adjective in Cato's rhetoric, and its frequent combination with *bonus*, see Till (1935) 27-8, 84-5; Cornell (2013) *ad* F41.
[257] It is possible, though seems less likely, that Cato's work featured a section, similar to the context of this citation in Pliny, on death itself. Such a section would be held in awkward counterpoint to the preface's claims for the potency of these treatments and Cato's personal longevity.
[258] F1; see above p.63-4.
[259] Garg. Mart. *Med*. 30 = *ad Marcum Filium* F3 C.

*History*,[260] which may well be its source.[261] The second of these fragments, taken from this same section of Pliny's work, discusses the potency of wild cabbage for healing nasal problems and as a nosegay.[262] Both fragments are attributed to the *Liber ad filium* on the grounds that they contain material, on the theme of medicine, which cannot be derived from any other part of Cato's extant works. While many of the details which these give about cabbage can be traced to section 157 of the *De agricultura*, there are, indeed, some which cannot.[263] This has led to relatively widespread support – particularly in the case of the passage found in Gargilius Martialis – for their insertion into the *Liber ad filium*.[264] However, in a recent edition of the *De agricultura*, Dalby has bracketed section 157 of the work as a gloss, on the grounds that this section is of a markedly different style to the *De agricultura*.[265] I find this exclusion wholly persuasive; not only the style of this section, but also its highly theoretical approach to the subject are vastly different from the rest of Cato's work.[266] It is probable that this section was an early interpolation into the text.[267] The discrediting of this section as Catonian material naturally discredits much of the content of these two fragments which depend upon it. It also raises questions for the few elements of Pliny and Gargilius Martialis which do not depend on section 157 of the *De agricultura*, i.e. Pliny's description of the potent, yet pleasant smell of cabbage, and Gargilius Martialis'

[260] Plin. *HN* 20.78
[261] Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001) *ad loc.*
[262] Plin. *HN* 20.92 = *ad Marcum Filium* F4 C.
[263] Namely the account of cabbage as the Romans' only form of medicine (F3), and the use of cabbage as a sweet and potent smelling salt (F4).
[264] On Gargilius Martialis: Schönberger (1969) 283-7; Schönberger then includes this passage as F361 of his edition of Cato; the fragment is also accepted by Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (1996) 199, Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi then include this passage in their 2001 edition. On Pliny: only Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi argue for the inclusion of this fragment in the *Liber ad filium* ((2001) *ad loc.*); while Goujard aligns it with part of the *De agricultura* (Goujard (1975) 316-7).
[265] 'Its mode of expression, vague repetitious, lacking rhythm, differs radically from his [Cato's].' Dalby (1998) 227 n.283. Dalby is not the first scholar to suggest this; see Boscherini (1993) 733 n.21 for a recent bibliography, although Boscherini himself is reluctant to exclude this section in full (1993) 733-5.
[266] On the different nature of this chapter, see also Boscherini (1970) 31-2, 62-3.
[267] Dalby (1998) 27. The text of the *De agricultura* is notoriously problematic - full of additions and repetitions; while some of this confusion is likely to be down to Cato's writing processes (Astin (1978) 191-203), some must arise from the work's manuscript tradition, with further difficulties posed by the unscientific emendations of renaissance scholars, see Goujard (1975) xlv-l. On the transmission of the work more generally, see Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 19, 149.

mention of its role as Rome's primary form of medicine. In view of the inauthenticity of the surrounding context it is likely that these details are also not of Catonian origin and derive from a further interpolation into this section of the *De agricultura*. The overwhelmingly positive picture which these passages paint of cabbage means that they might reasonably be traced to a paradoxical encomium on the vegetable, which may well have found its way into the *De agricultura*.[268] It is on these grounds that they have not been included in the present edition.

***De agricultura***

**F. 6** vir bonus est, Marce fili, colendi peritus, cuius ferramenta splendent.

A good man, Marcus my son, is an experienced husbandman, whose tools shine.

Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg*. 1.46
*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F6 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F7 C.

Servius cites these lines from Cato as part of his comment on Virgil's description of the plough brought into use in early spring: 'the worn ploughshare begins to shine,' (*attritus splendescere vomer*).[269] In order to note the effect that frequent use has on the ploughshare, Servius cites from both Lucretius and Cato, noting the twin effects which accompany heavy use, wearing away the metal and bringing its surface to a shine: 'we know what happens with

[268] Such encomia were sometimes composed as rhetorical exercises; see Cic. *Tusc*. 1.116; Pliny *HN* 20.91; Quint. *Inst*. 3.7.26-8; Pease (1926) 27-43; Pernot (1993) 525-46. The praise of cabbage found in section 156 of the *De agricultura* provides an appropriate landing point for such material. Furthermore, the reputation of the Censor as an orator; the use of his works within rhetorical instruction (see below on Fs 18-21); and the commonplace rhetorical exercise of composing speeches as though written by him (Plutarch knew an encomium of Athens in Greek which claimed the Censor's authorship (Plut *Cat. Mai*. 12.5 with Sansone (1989) *ad loc.*)); all strongly suggest that such encomiastic material existed and that it may well have been contaminated with the genuinely Catonian account of the properties of cabbage within section 156 of the *De agricultura*.
[269] Verg. *G*. 1.46.

regular ploughing, namely that it becomes more shiny and is worn away,' (*quod evenire frequenti aratione novimus, ut et splendidior fiat et teratur*). Servius introduces these words, which he appears to cite verbatim, of Cato as 'in a speech to his son,' (*in oratione ad filium*).[270] This description clearly connects this fragment to the *Liber ad filium*, with Servius invoking the address, *ad filium*, that has been identified as so distinctive of this text. While Servius' attribution of these words to a speech cannot be correct, since there is no occasion on which Cato would address a piece of oratory to his son, there are several plausible explanations for this erroneous description. It is possible that the address, *ad filium*, itself led Servius to think that this work was a piece of direct speech. More plausibly, as oratory was a distinctive element of the *Liber ad filium*, and Servius cites a similar fragment from the oratorical section of the work, it is likely that his meaning here is simply 'on oratory' rather than 'in a speech', using the most famous part of the *Liber ad filium* to designate the whole.[271] This would render Jahn's emendation of *oratione* to *aratione* unnecessary.[272]

These words are most appropriately attributed to the section of the *Liber ad filium* which offered instruction in agriculture, where they are typically placed at the very start of the topic.[273] There are several indicators within this line that it comes from a prefatory passage. The elevated tone of the line, created by Cato's use of the phrase 'a good man' (*vir bonus*), an archaic formula found in some of our earliest Latin inscriptions, which he emphatically positions at the start of this sentence, suggests that these words may have come from a preface, a passage which regularly featured high register language.[274] Furthermore, the generalised nature of this exaltation of the value of agricultural labour would act as an

[270] Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg*. 1.46.
[271] It cannot be excluded that Servius is simply in error here; he may well have misattributed this line to the work's section on oratory, alongside F18, which he also cites from this section.
[272] Cf. the case of F3, p.73.
[273] Jordan (1860); Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001).
[274] The *duenos* inscription (*CIL* $I^2$ .4), typically dated to around the 6th century BC, offers our earliest parallel for the phrase.

excellent introduction to the detailed advice on the subject which was offered in this section; engaging the *Liber*'s audience and encouraging them to see the worth of the work's content. Such generalised statements are found amidst the technical directions which make up the main body of the work, but they are less frequent there. This line also has parallels with two other passages which appear to have come from prefaces. The *vir bonus* and his attributes form the focus of Cato's preface to the *De agricultura*,[275] and feature in a fragment which likely introduces the *Liber ad Filium*'s section on oratory.[276] Placing this fragment first within this section of the work is also sensible, given the absence of other fragments which would work well here and the general tendency of citing sources to recall the opening lines of the texts which they quote.

The focus of these words is not upon agriculture itself, but rather upon the positive moral qualities which it produces; the initial position of 'a good man' (*vir bonus*) and the presentative use of *esse* strongly suggest that the morally upright man is the topic here. The description of this man as 'experienced' (*peritus*) and as one 'whose tools shine' (*cuius ferramenta splendent*), makes clear that it is long years of industrious labour that have developed these positive moral qualities within him.[277] This idea acts as an apt introduction to a section of the work giving instruction in the finer points of agricultural practice, highlighting why this work was so valuable and, in setting out the primary importance of hard work, laying the foundation for all subsequent advice. This line shows that the *Liber ad filium* was not a work entirely dedicated to dry and technical directions. Indeed, the extant fragments suggest a relatively wide-ranging piece with technical advice, general directives,

[275] Cato, *Agr*. *praef*. 1-4. On the relationship between these two passages, and the texts more widely, see below p.201-3.
[276] F18.
[277] The *vir bonus* was not only a man of good morals, but he was also a wealthy man (*OLD* s.v. *bonus, -a, -um,* 12a). This sense may well be operative here, too. This is certainly the case in the parallel passage from the *De agricultura*, where the pursuit of profit is an important theme of the preface; see Gratwick (2002). Such hard work and experience are likely to have made him wealthy, too.

and aphoristic sayings. While the focus of these aphoristic sayings is found in the prefatory passages, their presence throughout the work creates a varied tone which highlights the oral, occasional nature of its original delivery.[278]

The intrinsic moral value of hard agricultural work was a theme to which Cato returned at various points, most notably in his speeches, where he both emphasises his own laborious activities and the virtues which they have instilled within him, and exhorts others to an active lifestyle, but also in the *De agricultura*, where he holds that these values transfer positively to the military sphere.[279] This emphasis on the virtues of agricultural labour was not unique to Cato; indeed, the idea seems to have long been part of the Romans' self-perception and self-presentation.[280] That the idea manifests itself in both the *Liber ad filium* and the *De agricultura*, then, should not surprise us – both works propagate a particular version of a widely held belief. The verbal similarities of these passages, are, nonetheless remarkable. This very deliberate repetition is, I believe, rather different in kind to much of the shared content found in the *Liber* and the *De agricultura*, and is suggestive of careful Catonian craft within these lines.[281] These passages ask to be read together and in doing so they present a fine picture of Cato inculcating his son in his ancestral values.[282]

[278] Cf. Cato, *Agr*. 61, where we find an aphoristic saying used to conclude a technical passage amidst the main body of the work.
[279] On his own agricultural activities as proof of his moral worth, see Cato *ORF*$^{3}$ 128; on the positive values more generally, see Columella, *Rust*. 11.1.26; on the importance of being physically fit, see Cato *ORF*$^{3}$ 78-80; on the idea in the *De agricultura*, see *Agr*. *praef*. 4.
[280] See below p.193 n.173.
[281] Scholars have offered a variety of explanations for the shared content of the *Liber ad filium* and the *De agricultura*, most frequently that one work was derivative of the other; Mazzarino, for example, builds an elaborate structure of Cato's composition process ((1952) 52-5). However, such reuse and repetition of material, while to be expected to a degree in works which treat the same subject, surely indicates that these works were derived ultimately directly from the same text, a set of Cato's own household notes. These notes have been expanded and elaborated in different forms, varying in accordance with the aims and addressees of the different texts. The *Liber ad Filium*, a much shorter work than the *De agricultura*, appears to be a more selective version of the notes, written with an eye to a younger agriculturalist and a more general educational purpose.
[282] See below p.201-3.

**F. 7** laudato ingentia rura exiguum colito

Praise large estates, cultivate a small one

Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg.* 2.412

*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F9 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F9 C.

Commenting on this phrase of Virgil, 'praise large estates, cultivate a small one,' (*laudato ingentia rura, / exiguum colito*),[283] Servius informs us that Cato was of the same opinion, 'Cato also says this in the books for his son on agriculture,' (*hoc etiam Cato ait in libris ad filium de agri cultura*). Indeed, Servius's presentation of Cato's opinion, he terms it a *dictum*, implies that the Censor was commonly cited on this point and that these words had become something of a proverb.[284] While Cato's actual words are unknowable, it appears that they were a saying of quotable potential. Struggling to understand the value of this advice, Servius posits that it might refer to maintaining large amounts of woodland and pasture alongside a small portion of arable land, or more probably, to his mind, that it refers to the practice of cultivating a small portion of one's estate at any one time, whilst letting the rest of it lie fallow. This, he claims, was the reason that Cato praised large estates in the *De agricultura* (*nam et Cato, ut diximus, et Cicero in oeconomicis ob hoc laudat praedia latifundia*).[285] Servius' attribution of the proverb, 'in the books for his son on agriculture,' (*in libris ad filium de agri cultura*) clearly places this sentiment within the agricultural section of the *Liber ad filium*. Servius is the only citing source who refers to the *Liber* as a work in several books.[286] It is difficult to know what to make of his various descriptions of the text, or of his reference to these *libri*; he may be confusing the *Liber* with the *De agricultura*, or confusing

[283] Verg. *G.* 2.412-3.
[284] Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg.* 2.412.
[285] Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg.* 2.412.
[286] This has helped to provide support for the reconstruction of the *Liber ad filium* as an encyclopaedia in multiple books, an idea now discredited; see above p.30 n.77.

the different sections of the work, or confusing the *Liber* with other works with which it was edited.[287] It is probable that, while Servius clearly knew the ideas and images of the *Liber ad filium* well, he did not have it to hand at the time of writing, and thus did not recollect its exact form.

There is no clear indication of whereabouts within this section the fragment is to be found. It would fit well within a discussion on the purchase of land and the merits of different sorts of estates. It is on this basis that I have placed it early on within Cato's treatment of agriculture; such advice should logically form the first topic of this section of the treatise, procuring land being a clear preliminary to learning to work it.[288] This exhortation to own a small plot may simply be aimed at a young farmer, such as Licinianus, who was just starting in the business and who would thus find less land much easier to manage;[289] however, it seems likely that the exhortation also has ideological weight, and its moral and ethical emphasis would align this fragment with the preceding one, again suggesting that it was to be found early on within this section.

The idea of working a small plot of land as a self-sufficient farmer had significant moral implications for the Romans. Such plots were typically of seven *iugera*, the so-called plebeian measure, and were worked by such eminent leaders such as Dentatus, Regulus, and Cincinnatus, who pointedly claimed that this portion of land was fit to meet all of their needs.[290] These prominent claims demonstrate the ideological importance of such small plots,

[287] On the likelihood of the *Liber* being edited alongisde other Catonian works, see below p.145-6.
[288] Cato's discussion of the best estate to purchase is positioned similarly early within the *De agricultura* (*Agr.* 1); if these works shared a source then it is probable that they also share a similar structure.
[289] This is the sense of the passage in Virgil in relation to which Servius makes this citation. Columella, too, highlights the value of a small, well kept plot over a larger, poorly managed estate; see *Rust.* 1.3.9-10.
[290] A plot of this size was distributed to each citizen after the expulsion of the kings by C. Licinius, the first tribune of the plebs; for a further discussion of the distribution and its later ideological importance, see Leigh (2004a) 14-6.

offering these individuals a connection to Rome's past simplicity and to the prestige that such antiquity and austerity brought.[291] It is possible, then, that this recommendation formed part of a preface based on Cato's own ideological vision of the virtue instilled by the frugal ways and hard work associated with farming of this sort. While this vision is difficult to reconcile with Cato's personal agricultural practices, this is not an incongruity which prevented the Censor from promoting his virtue as instilled by a frugal, rural upbringing, or from framing his *De agricultura* as an embodiment of that virtue.[292] An introduction to this section of the *Liber ad filium* of such ideological weight would be wholly appropriate for the wider purposes of the work in educating Licinianus, training the son in the ways that his father learnt as a youth. The ideological emphasis of these words, with their rejection of avaricious and profit-driven agriculture is significant;[293] it shows us that the *Liber ad filium* was concerned not only with technical expertise in farming, but also with its values, and that, in this, it was similar in strategy to the *De agricultura*. This suggests that the work may well have had a much wider purpose than the education of his son, and was an important element of Cato's crafting of his image and his strategic self-promotion.[294] The potential of such agricultural imagery in the service of his own political persona was apparently well known to Cato and it forms a rich theme throughout his works.[295]

[291] The negligible historical accuracy of some of the stories relating the measure does not appear to have affected its ideological implcations.
[292] The incongruity between the preface of the *De agricultura*, which extols small-scale, self-sufficient farming, and the main body of the work, which is designed around a large estate worked by slave labour, farmed for profit, has long been recognised; various interpretations of this supposed inconsistency have been proposed, most recently Leigh (2004a) has argued for a disconnect caused by drastic social change and Reay (2005) for a connection between the landowner bodily working the land and working embodied in his slaves.
[293] Cato also treated avarice in first fragment of the *Carmen de moribus*.
[294] A straightforward, practical interpretation of this advice cannot be ruled out. The context of this line in Virgil, after all, is focused upon saving labour, rather than about desiring a smaller vintage and fewer profits. The general terms of this statement would then function as an apt introduction or conclusion to a discussion on the practical merits of cultivating a small estate.
[295] See below p.147-205.

**F. 8** ebulum vel prunus silvestris vel rubus, bulbus minutus, trifolium, herba pratensis, quercus, silvestris pirus, malus frumentari soli notae, item nigra terra et cinerei coloris. omnis creta coquet, nisi permacra, sabulumque, nisi id etiam pertenue est, et multo campestribus magis quam clivosis respondent eadem.

The danewort or the wild plum or blackberry, or the small-bulb, clover, meadow grass, oak, wild pear, apple are the indications of corn-producing soil, so too earth that is black and the colour of ash. All clayey soil will dry up, unless it is very thin, and so will sand, unless it is also very fine, and yields from the same type of soil will be much greater on level ground than on sloping.

Plin. *HN* 18.34
*ad Marcum Filium* F13 C.

Pliny claims to cite these words of Cato's verbatim, using the Censor's authority on all matters agricultural in order to reinforce his own teachings on how to judge the quality of land: 'yet nevertheless I will supplement the indications given particularly with some words of Cato,' (*etiamnum tamen traditas notas subsignabimus Catonis maxime verbis*).[296] Cato's judgement concludes Pliny's discussion of the matter.[297] These words are not found in the *De agricultura*, which discusses related subjects at several points, and this has led editors to attribute them to the *Liber ad filium*.[298] Since Pliny cites directly from the *Liber* elsewhere in his *Natural History* this attribution makes much good sense. These lines are likely to have been part of Cato's discussion of the purchase of good land, highlighting positive signs to identify soil ripe for cultivation. As such, these lines would belong to the beginning of the *Liber*'s section on agriculture, in close proximity to the preceding fragment.[299]

[296] Plin. *HN* 18.34.
[297] These words also appear to be the source, though uncited, for Columella, *Rust.* 2.2.14.
[298] *Agr*. 37.1-2, 34.2.
[299] This position would be in parallel to the discussion in the *De agricultura*, see above p.86 n.288. On the careful organisation of that text, see Dalby (1998) 18-21.

These lines display some of the technical expertise which made up the majority of the *Liber ad filium*. The care which they embody, enabling the recipient of this advice to evaluate fully the soil of his potential estate and to make a sound investment in its purchase are typical of Cato. These features reflect the Censor's concern for value for money, making a secure investment, and a steady profit. The guidance given here is solid advice for a young farmer starting out and would well suit a work directed at an adolescent son.

**F. 9** talem pestem vitare censuit et in primis futurum agricolam praemonuit ne sua sponte ad eam perveniret.

He thought that such a nuisance [a worthless neighbour] ought to be avoided and, in particular, he gave advance warning of this to a future farmer, in order that he might not border one if he can help it.

Columella, *Rust*. 1.3.7
*ad Marcum Filium* F11 C.

Columella cites these words from Cato as the conclusion to his discussion on bad neighbours and the problems that they cause. Columella himself vouches for the truth of Cato's statement, 'rightly then, as far as my opinion goes, Marcus Porcius...' (*iure igitur, quantum mea fert opinio, M. Porcius...*), which he seems to paraphrase fairly closely here.[300] While attributing these lines clearly to Cato, Columella does not specify a particular work from which they are taken. They are attributed to the *Liber ad filium* by editors on the basis that they do not appear in the discussion of the subject in the *De agricultura*.[301] There are certainly problems with this methodology. We have already noted that the manuscript

[300] Columella, *Rust*. 1.3.7.
[301] *Agr*. 1.2, 4.2.

tradition of the *De agricultura* is rather problematic; it is possible that these words were present in the manuscripts, either written by Cato, or added by an early editor, but were removed as a repetition by a later copyist and thus do not survive into the branch of the tradition on which our text is based.[302] They may well originate, then, from the *De agricultura*. The technical and agricultural nature of some of Cato's speeches means that we should not rule out the possibility that this passage may have been taken from an oratorical work.[303] Nonetheless, the subject matter here is highly suggestive of an origin in the *Liber ad filium*; the choice of land, and consequently of neighbour was a significant subject which we would expect to be treated in such a work, and this fragment, along with the preceding one, may well have made up part of the discussion of this topic. Furthermore, Columella's description of this advice as offered, 'to a future farmer,' (*futurum agricolam*),[304] strongly suggests the *Liber* as the source text; this work was clearly addressed to an aspiring farmer in Licinianus, while Cato's wider agricultural works, by contrast, do not have a clear addressee at all. This advice is likely to have been placed just after the opening of this section on agriculture; the purchase of land, to which the terms of the advice offered here clearly relate, is most sensibly treated as the first concern of a work on agriculture.

The content of this advice represents widespread common sense.[305] Cato himself was a well recognised pragmatist and he clearly endorsed such longstanding wisdom. From what we can tell of Cato's original words as described in Columella, this sounds like a serious and sententious admonition given in no uncertain terms; the description of difficult neighbours as 'such a nuisance' (*talem pestem*) is an emphatic declaration of a distinct agricultural colour, while the terms in which this judgement was presented 'he thought' (*censuit*) make clear that

[302] See above p.80 n.267.
[303] On the technical aspects of Cato's censorial speeches, see below p.199.
[304] Columella, *Rust.* 1.3.7.
[305] Managing social relationships makes up a large proportion of the advice offered in collections of maxims - they make up, for example, a fifth of first book of the *Disticha Catonis.*

this view was not a matter of debate. Columella himself reassures the reader not only of the value of this advice, but also of the authority of Cato on this subject.

**F. 10** quod male emptum est, semper paenitet.

A bad purchase is always regretted.

Plin. *HN* 18.26
*ad Marcum Filium* F16 C.

Pliny cites this saying, apparently verbatim, alongside several other generalised statements on the purchase of farmland, all of which can be attributed to the beginning of the *De agricultura*.[306] As these particular words cannot be found in that text, editors have ascribed it to the *Liber ad filium*, using the methodology outlined above.[307] The problems with this methodology have also been highlighted above and, in particular, the very generalised nature of this statement suggests that it may well have had a place in one of Cato's speeches. However, several factors promote the inclusion of this fragment within the *Liber ad filium*; its citing source, Pliny, knew the *Liber* well and cites from it elsewhere; the summative tone of this saying would well suit a short, selective work like the *Liber*, and it may well have introduced or concluded a short discussion on the topic of making a purchase.[308] It should also be noted that Cato may well have repeated material, including statements such as this one which were so central to his thought, using them in both the *Liber ad filium* and more widely in his speeches. It is difficult to determine the exact position of this line within the

[306] The other statements cited here are all quoted verbatim, so it seems reasonable to assume this for these words, too.
[307] p.89-90.
[308] Cf. F12 on the topic of vines.

agricultural section of the *Liber*; the general principle would act as an excellent conclusion to a longer discussion on making purchases for the farm, or indeed, of the farm itself. Given that this is its context in the citing source and that there appears to have been such a discussion about the purchase of farmland early on in the agricultural section of the *Liber ad filium*, this fragment has been positioned as the conclusion to that discussion.

The focus on making sound financial decisions, so clear in this statement, is typical of the advice that fathers traditionally offered to their sons. This can be seen particularly in the admonitions made by those *patres* of contemporary Roman Comedy.[309] The strongly paternal character of the line may well have been felt by its audience here; this would certainly act as a pertinent reminder, at the conclusion of the first major topic of this section, to the work's addressee and its ostensible educational aims. The proverbial tone of the line is felt both in the careful balance of its two phrases, the first describing the brief action of making a bad purchase, and the second describing its lasting effect, and in its use of the simple terminology of *bonus* and *malus* to describe the action involved. The use of such commonplace and common sense proverbs within the *Liber ad filium* connects Cato's advice – much of it highly novel and technical - to a long tradition of received wisdom in which he also inculcates his son.

**F. 11** hanc uvam [rhaeticam] Cato praecipue laudat in libris, quos scripsit ad filium; contra Catullus eam vituperat et dicit nulli rei esse aptam, miraturque cur eam laudaverit Cato.

Cato especially praises this grape in the books that he wrote for his son; on the contrary Catullus criticises it and says that it is good for nothing, wondering why Cato praised it.

[309] On buyer's and seller's remorse, see Plaut. *Mostell*. 795-802. For a father rejoicing in his son's succesful purchase, see Plaut. *Mostell*. 636-40. On the financial advice typical of these characters more generally, see below p.157-9, 169.

Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Georg.* 2.95

*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F8 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F8 C.

Servius cites these two very different perspectives on the qualities of the Rhaetic grape as part of his comment on Virgil's apostrophe to the variety, 'how shall I hymn you, Rhaetic grape?,' (*quo te carmine dicam, / Rhaetica?*).[310] Servius claims that Virgil knew these conflicting opinions on the grape, and thus was unsure of the terms in which he ought to describe the variety, 'therefore, aware of both of these views, Virgil kept to the middle ground, saying 'how shall I hymn you, Rhaetic grape?,' (*sciens ergo utrumque Vergilius medium tenuit, dicens 'quo te carmine dicam Raetica'?*).[311] While Servius' interpretation of Virgil here is not necessarily correct,[312] his assumption that Virgil knew and read Cato's agricultural works, as did Catullus, is surely right. This certainly gives an impression – one confirmed by the influence of Cato on writers such as Varro and Columella, and, ultimately, by the survival of the *De agricultura* - of how widely read and well regarded Cato's agricultural advice was.[313] Servius' attribution of these words, 'in the books that he wrote for his son,' (*in libris, quos scripsit ad filium*) clearly sets these words within the *Liber ad filium.* Servius' confused and confusing reference to the work as consisting of multiple books seems likely to have been made in error.[314]

[310] Verg. *G*. 2.95-6.
[311] Serv. *Comm. in Verg*. *Georg*. 2.95.
[312] The catalogue of different varieties of grape is one of the most exuberant passages of this book of the *Georgics* and the joyful mood of these lines seems rather out of step with a serious concern about the value of one of the varieties listed. On the passage, see Putnam (1979) 94-5.
[313] It is difficult to imagine a context for Catullus discussing the finer qualities of different grapes in such a way as to invoke Cato's authority on the subject (Catull. F5). The only discussion of agriculture in the poet's work comes in poem 64, where rustic pursuits are abandoned for the urbane glamour of the wedding feast of Peleus and Thetis (l.35-42); however, it is possible that Catullus spoke on the Rhaetic grape in an exercise of his local knowledge – the variety would have been familiar from his upbringing in Northern Italy, and perhaps it is in this context that he comments on and critiques Cato's well-known advice on the subject.
[314] See above p.85-6.

This piece of advice is particularly difficult to place within this section of the *Liber ad filium*. Technical in nature and giving direction on the varieties of vine, these lines form part of the practical agricultural topics which made up the majority of the work. There is no way of knowing whereabouts Cato would have discussed such a subject. I have positioned these lines relatively early on within this section, since planting would have been amongst the first tasks undertaken by a new landowner, and, as such, these directions follow on well from the preceding fragments which advise on the purchase of land. While a sensible suggestion, it should be noted that there is no certainty of this sequence.

It is difficult to determine, from Servius' description, what Cato's exact words on the Rhaetic grape were. Cato clearly favoured the variety and he may have declared its superiority to other species of grape. As a product of cooler, wetter, Northern Italy, Cato may well have praised the hardy endurance and productivity of this vine. It is possible that these lines came from a longer passage discussing the suitability of different types of vines for different soils and settings.[315] These directions offered important practical advice to an owner of a vineyard. The observations made here may have been made at first hand during time which Cato spent in Cisalpine Gaul. Cato has much to say about the area and its people in the *Origines*, a work rich in geographical and botanical observations.[316] The inclusion of such personal observation and experience was typical of Cato's wider written works and it seems certain that he would wish to instruct his son from the fruits of his own knowledge.

**F. 12** nullum genus vitium conserendum esse nisi fama, nullum diutius conservandum nisi experimento probatum.

[315] Cato discusses planting along these lines at *Agr*. 6-9.
[316] See, for example, F31, 40, 46a, 62, 75, 94, 99, 111, 121-2 *FRHist*.

No variety of vine should be sown unless it is of good repute, no variety should be preserved any longer, unless it is proven by trial.

Columella, *Rust*. 3.2.31
*ad Marcum Filium* F14 C.

These words are cited by Columella as the conclusion to his discussion of the various different kinds of vines and their respective merits. On noting how the same variety is given different designations by different peoples and places, Columella states that it is easier not to try and teach a specific variety as being the best vine: 'therefore a wise teacher does not hinder his scholars by seeking to engage with nomenclature of this sort, which is impossible to master,' (*quare prudentis magistri est eius modi nomenclationis aucupio, quo potiri nequeat, studiosos non demorari;*). He adds that it is better to instruct with a general rule: 'but he sets forth the whole matter as in what Celsus says and before him Marcus Cato,' (*sed illud in totum praecipere, quod Celsus ait et ante eum Marcus Cato*).[317] This advice, then, is presented as a useful practical summary of a potentially confusing topic. Columella does not attribute this teaching to any particular work of Cato. However, his presentation of Cato as a 'wise teacher' (*prudens magister*), whose aim was to explain a complicated and important agricultural topic, in short, simple terms 'he sets forth the whole matter' (*illud in totum praecipere*), would well suit the aims and addressee of the *Liber ad filium*.[318] The concise summary offered in this direction would fit well within the short, selective nature of this text, while the strong didactic emphasis would make this a suitable part of Licinianus' instruction.[319] The content of this advice, furthermore, is clearly attributed to Cato and is

[317] Columella, *Rust*. 3.2.31.
[318] This concern for instructing the young in the ways of agriculture is also found at F9.
[319] Columella's note that the advice was found in both Cato and Celsus has lent weight to the idea, now discredited, that Celsus' encyclopaedic work was based upon a product of similar scale and scope by Cato. For this theory, see Barwick (1948) and Krenkel (1959); for its problems, see above p.29-35.

agricultural in nature, but lacking a place within the *De agricultura*; while it is possible to attribute this to a section, either genuinely Catonian or an early interpolation, which was then removed from the surviving manuscript tradition of that work, or to a speech, it seems more likely that it should be traced to the *Liber ad filium*.[320] From the context which Columella gives to his citation, it is likely that this advice concluded a discussion of the merits of different types of vine; it is both summative and direct in tone strongly suggesting that it was designed to round off discussion. It has therefore been placed after Cato's discussion of the Rhaetic grape, where it may have formed part of a discussion on planting a vineyard.

The pithy expression of these lines is typical of Cato. The two contrasting elements, the reputation of the vine and its proof by trial, are sharply opposed and the contrast between them highlights the diverse elements and skills which work towards successful cultivation; the landowner must be a careful and dedicated researcher, and willing to listen to the advice of others in the first instance, yet he must learn, ultimately, to rely on his own experience.[321] This commonsensical advice thus offers a description of the progress made by any new agriculturalist, from the reliance on texts such as the *Liber*, to a self-sufficiency based on knowledge and experience. Indeed, Cato's ability to compose such a text proves his own capability and experience. The practical orientation of this advice thus highlights Cato's own practicality, an element of his public image he was certainly keen to cultivate. The general principle expressed here emphasises again the varied tone of the *Liber ad filium*; even amidst technical discussion we can find examples of wit and colour such as this neat phrase.

**F. 13** illi imperator tu, ille ceteris mediastrinus

[320] Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001) and Speranza (1974) both position this fragment in the *Liber*.
[321] This bipartite structure of expression is a feature of Cato's language; see *ORF*[3] 20, 66, 224; and of many of the sayings attributed to him; see Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 8-9.

You give orders to him, he is a general attendant for the others.

Non. p.208 l.7-8 L.

*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F7 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F22 C.

Nonius cites these words from Cato as part of his entry for *mediastrinos*. The *mediastrinus* was a servant employed on general duties.[322] In his entry, Nonius is keen to point out that the term did not simply refer to bath attendants, but to all general attendants about the estate, recalling a passage of Lucilius, which refers to one Aristocrates as 'a farm manager, a general attendant, ploughman,' (*vilicus, mediastrinus, bubulcus*), alongside these words of Cato.[323] Nonius cites the phrase as found 'in Cato's Teachings for his Son,' (*Cato in Praeceptis ad Filium*), a description which must refer to the *Liber ad filium*.[324] The mention of the work's most distinctive feature, its prominent address to Licinianus, combined with an impression of its didactic nature, clearly associate this line with the *Liber*.[325] Furthermore, the technical terminology of the line makes a fine fit for the subject matter of this text, as does the description of the work as one of 'teachings,' (*praeceptis*), a word which may highlight the prominence of sayings and aphorisms within the *Liber*. Nonius cites these words verbatim, but it is unlikely that he knew Cato at first hand, and he was probably citing through an intermediary source here.[326] This fragment, which appears to be part of a discussion of the organisation of the household, could well be placed anywhere within this section of the *Liber*

[322] *OLD* s.v. *mediastrinus, -i.*
[323] Non. p.208 l.6 L.
[324] Non. p.208 l.7-8 L.
[325] While Cato does appear to have authored a collection of sayings, this was certainly not addressed to his son (see above p.35-7). It is possible that Nonius' work of *praecepta* may be a late collection of Cato's sayings, formed as though for Licinianus. While such collections certainly existed - the *Disticha Catonis* provides an example of one - it is difficult to see why this line would have been included in it. All things considered, the most sensible reading of Nonius' citation is as part of the *Liber ad filium*.
[326] Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 31-3; Nonius made widespread use of Gellius without acknowledgement and he may be a source for this line; see Cornell (2013) 73, 92-6.

*ad filium*.[327] It is difficult to know at what point Cato would have turned his thoughts and the bent of his instruction to a discussion of managing the household, but the topic was an important one, which surely had a place here.

The instruction of this line is directed at Licinianus, the work's addressee, who is the *tu* designated as 'giving orders' (*imperator*). The use of the second person pronoun is a significant demonstration of the constancy of the addressee throughout the work; not only does an address to Licinianus occur in the preface, but also amidst the technical matters that formed the main body of the work. This is a notable contrast to the *De agricultura*, in which the addressee, when present, fluctuates.[328] This fragment, then, sets out a basic pattern of authority for the household; with the addressee, 'you' (*tu*), the landowner, giving orders to 'him' (*illi*), a figure who is presumably the farm manager; this farm manager is then a 'general attendant' (*mediastrinus*) for the household's other slaves. This line thus aptly summarises the central relationships which underpin the running of the household, making clear the necessary patterns of authority to maintain a happy order. This would be highly useful practical advice, and may well be of particular value for a young farmer, who would struggle to assert his authority over the household. The farm manager (*vilicus*) is often an unwieldy and unprepossessing character in comic theatre, thus requiring strict governance by his master, a skill in which it would be well worth offering instruction.[329] The duties of the *vilicus* and his wife are also treated at length in the *De agricultura*, in passages which denote the importance of appropriately managing this member of staff.[330] The advice offered in both

[327] In their edition Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi are reluctant to attribute this fragment to any one particular section of the text; however, I believe that its content would be well suited to a discussion on houshold management (such as that found at *Agr*. 2, 5.1-5, 142-3), and have thus placed it, with Jordan, in the agricultural section of this text.
[328] The work variously addresses a would-be landowner (*Agr*. 1), landowner (*Agr*. 2), farm manager (*Agr*. 5), and manager's wife (*Agr*. 142-3), who is also presumably the addressee of the recipes contained within the work (*Agr*. 74-88).
[329] Pomponius made fun of a jumped up *vilicus* challenging his master's authority; Pompon. *CRF*$^{3}$ 45 Ribbeck.
[330] *Agr*. 2, 5, 142-3.

the *De agricultura* and the *Liber ad filium* likely draws on the same body of notes and wealth of personal experience of the Censor.

**F. 14** male agitur cum domino, quem vilicus docet.

Things don't go well with the master whom the farm manager instructs.

Columella, *Rust.* 11.1.4
*ad Marcum Filium* F15 C.

Columella cites these lines as part of his discussion of the role and duties of the farm manager. According to Columella, the farm manager should be an able and experienced husbandman himself, and capable of teaching his labourers by example. Ideally, the landowner (*dominus*) would also be a knowledgeable agriculturalist and capable of instructing his farm manager. Columella laments that this can no longer be the case, as so few men nowadays know how to farm, and he cites Cato's words as a description of the good old times gone past: 'Cato, an example of our former ways, even said of the head of the household,' (*cum etiam de patre familiae prisci moris exemplum Cato dixerit*).[331] Columella's description of Cato's words, written 'on the head of the household' (*de patre familiae*) implies that this line was part of a discussion on the role of the father as the head of the house. Columella also attributes similar advice to the Censor as part of an earlier discussion of the *vilicus*: 'the field whose owner does not instruct, but rather listens to his farm manager with regard to what must be done in it, is handled very badly,' (*agrum pessime mulcari cuius dominus quid in eo faciendum sit non docet sed audit vilicum*).[332] Columella's

[331] Columella, *Rust*. 11.1.4.
[332] Columella, *Rust*. 1.2.2.

description of the line, 'it is an old saying of Cato,' (*illud vetus est Catonis*), strongly suggests that this phrase was a well known one, possibly proverbial. It seems likely that he has recalled the words either verbatim, or in close paraphrase.[333] Columella attributes both of these statements to Cato, but does not place either of them in a particular work. This fragment has been set in the *Liber ad filium* by editors using the same methodology employed for Fs 8, 9, and 12; its subject is of an agricultural nature, but does not find a parallel in our text of the *De agricultura*.[334] While it is impossible to rule out that these words – whether genuine or not - have simply been lost from our text of the *De agricultura*, or a description of the *vilicus* in one of Cato's speeches,[335] the fragment is indeed a likely fit for the *Liber ad filium.* Columella's description of Cato's discussion *de patre familiae* would be very well placed within the *Liber*, which treated the most important elements of that role – farming, medicine, and oratory - with a view to educating Licinianus in his duties. Managing one's domestics must have been an important aspect of the day-to-day life of the *pater familias* and we would expect to find instruction in it within the agricultural section of the work. The summative quality of the advice given here also fits well with the short, selective nature of the *Liber*. This line has been positioned to follow the other fragment discussing patterns of authority within the household, which is attributed to the *Liber* with certainty, and these two form a clear unit of instruction in managing one's labour force. The aphoristic tone of this line may indicate that it opened or concluded this unit.

Cato, as has been noted above, did not appear to feel a contradiction between his discussion of how to manage an estate worked largely by slave labour and his claims about the value of a small farm and the virtue of hands-on agricultural work in the *Liber ad filium*. Both of these

[333] Columella, *Rust.* 1.2.2.
[334] Although the work does discuss the *vilicus* at several other points (*Agr*. 2, 5, 142-3).
[335] Indeed, the *vilicus* is mentioned in Cato's speech, *Uti Basilica Aedificetur* (*ORF*[3] XV).

elements form part of Cato's agricultural outlook, which saw the long-established value and virtue of Roman self-sufficient agriculture still maintained in experienced *domini* such as himself, in spite of the very new manifestation of agriculture which he practised and promoted.[336]

The pithy expression of this line, balancing the fate of the landowner against the behaviour of the manager, a balance carefully reinforced with the alliteration of 'd' in *dominus* and *docet*, is very typical of Cato's style. So too is the use of the adverb *male*; the preponderance of the simple terms such as *malus* and *bonus* in Cato's *De agricultura* can be seen as as an indication of the register of the work and the early stage of Latin prose writing which it represents.[337] The similar frequency of the terms found in the *Liber ad filium*, attests again to the relationship of these two texts and may reflect the simple and straightforward terms in which Cato kept his household notes. It is difficult to say how much of the simple style found in these texts was deliberately maintained by the Censor in an effort to emphasise his personal practical experience, a pose of no small political value.

**F. 15** commemoravit quod nec tempestatibus adfligeretur ut aliae partes ruris minimeque sumptus egens per omnis annos praeberet reditum neque eum simplicem, cum etiam in pabulo non minus redderet quam in faeno.

He [Cato] recorded that it [the meadow] isn't damaged by storms, as other areas of the estate, and managing without the least outlay it offers a return year on year and that is not a single one, since it yields no less in fodder than in hay.

[336] On the particular importance of these very modern agricultural developments as contemporary elite cultural currency, see below p.200 n.201.
[337] On *bonus, -a, um*, see Courtney (1999) 53; on the register of Cato's works, see Till (1935) 32-3; Briscoe (2005), (2010), Cornell (2013) 23-5; on the simplicity of early prose, see Palmer (1954) 118-23.

Columella, *Rust*. 2.16.2
*ad Marcum Filium* F12 C.

Columella cites these words from Cato as part of a wider discussion on maintaining cattle and, in particular, on the production of hay, an essential for the upkeep of such livestock. Columella calls upon Cato's authority to reinforce his view that the meadow, as a chief source of hay, was of central importance in agriculture. Columella cites this list of the meadow's positive qualities, according to Cato: 'Indeed, Marcus Porcius Cato recorded that...' (*M. quidem Porcius et illa commemoravit, quod...*), in order to prove his point.[338] These words then preface a detailed discussion on maintaining different kinds of meadows. While Columella does not indicate that this is a verbatim citation, these words are presented, to all intents and purposes, as though they are Cato's own. These words are not attributed to any particular work of Cato's and have been ascribed to the *Liber ad filium* by editors as they have no place in the discussion of the meadow in our text of the *De agricultura*.[339] Indeed, they may well find a ready place here; the topic is an important one to discuss in any text treating agriculture, and Columella's quotation implies an almost verbatim citation from a work which he knew, like the *Liber*. The list-like structure and the technicalities of the passage would also be difficult to set within one of Cato's speeches, even those of his censorship which treated agricultural management. On these grounds, and as testament to the general reliability of Columella's careful research, I have left this fragment within the *Liber ad filium*. While the technical subject matter of these lines places them within the main body of the work, the absence of any other citations on this topic, or any clear sense of the internal structure of the topics within this section of the *Liber*, make it impossible to position

[338] Columella, *Rust*. 2.16.2.
[339] *Agr* 1.7.

precisely in the work. The fragment has, therefore, been left amidst the larger body of technical material.

The attitude reflected in these lines is one also found in Cato's *De agricultura* and in his approach to business more generally. Cato's desire to minimise risk in his investments, particularly in those subject to Jove's wind and weather, is attested in Plutarch;[340] while the concern to bring in the maximum profit, for minimal expenditure, is apparent throughout his *De agricultura*. The style of these lines, a pointed and practically oriented list is also readily paralleled in Cato's longer agricultural work and probably reflects the style of much of the body of notes which formed the source for these two works.[341] This reflects the practical pose of both of these texts. Columella's hearty endorsement of Cato's opinion on the subject of the meadow, suggests that this was a widespread and well-accepted farming fact, further reinforcing the commonplace practicality of the *Liber ad filium*.

**F. 16** quidquid per asellum fieri potest, vilissime constat.

Whatever can be done with an ass costs very little.

Plin. *HN* 18.44
*ad Marcum Filium* F17 C.

Pliny cites these words of Cato, apparently verbatim, as part of a collection of general principles for agriculture, which he cannot ascribe to the discussion of any one particular topic within his *Natural History*. Pliny does not specify these words as coming from a

[340] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 21.5.
[341] Cf. *Agr*. 10, 54, 56-7, 63, 135.1-5.

particular work, but he highlights how often Cato repeated this advice, pointing out that 'he is not slow to advise that...' (*praedicere non cessat is*...).[342] The subject matter, strongly agricultural and of a technical bent, suggests that these lines were taken from the *Liber ad filium*, as they find no place in our text of the *De agricultura*. While there can be no certainty of this attribution, as has been noted above, Pliny's emphatic declaration that this was a topic to which Cato returned (*non cessat*) suggests that the statement was repeated on a number of occasions in different works, and perhaps we should not worry too much about the lack of a direct connection with the *Liber* in this instance. Frugality was a topic to which we know Cato returned again and again and it is extremely unlikely that he did not touch upon it in the work which he wrote to instruct his son in some sense. Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi place this fragment in their edition of the *Liber ad filium* and I am happy to reproduce this position, particularly given Pliny's knowledge of the work. The technical advice of this fragment, treating the usefulness and low cost of keeping an ass, must have come from the main body of this section, possibly from a discussion on livestock.[343] I have thus positioned it amidst the other technical directives of this section, but cannot be any more specific.

Cato's observation on the utility of the ass most likely derives from his own practical experience and may well be taken directly from his private household notes; this instruction would be a timely reminder to his farm manager, as much as a useful guide for his son.[344] It represents the practical and pragmatic approach typical of the *Liber ad filium* and of the *De agricultura*. The importance of saving pence on small jobs is an important element of Cato's attitude towards generating a substantial profit.

[342] Plin. *HN* 18.44.
[343] It is possible to see a pun in this line between *asellus, i* – 'a donkey, ass' and *as, assis* - 'a copper coin': work achieved either for an *as* or by means of an *asellus* would have been done very cheaply. For similar parallels made between coinage and livestock, see Plaut. *Persa* 316-5; *Truculentus* 653-4. On the derivation of Latin financial language from agricultural terms, see de Meo (1983) 29-31. On Cato's keen wit, see above p.36-7.
[344] The ass represented the cheapest from of labour; on its servile status in Greek thought, see Griffiths (2006a and 2006b).

**F. 17** *οὐκ ἀνδρός, ἀλλὰ χήρας γυναικὸς εἶναι τὸ μειῶσαί τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων*

It is not the part of a man, but of a widow, to lessen the value of their estate.

Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 21.8

*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F12 J. = *Incertorum Librorum Fragmenta* F46 C.

Plutarch cites these words of Cato as part of the conclusion of a chapter discussing Cato's diverse money-making ventures, including his agricultural activities, his investments in overseas trade, and his practice of usury. Plutarch records that Cato urged his son to take part in such activities (*προτρέπων δὲ υἱὸν ἐπὶ ταῦτα*), with the exhortation given in this fragment.[345] The citation is likely to be verbatim, or very nearly verbatim; Plutarch indicates that he has taken these words directly from a work of the Censor's with his claim that 'he [Cato] says' (*φησίν*), and both the contrasting imagery and the distinctive use of hyperbole, as well as the subject matter, are typical of the Censor. Plutarch does not explicitly attribute these words to the *Liber ad filium*, but his assertion that they were addressed to Licinianus make this work the most appropriate text in which to locate them. The subject of the fragment, the increasing of one's estate, is hard to place within either the *Historia* or the *Epistulae*, the other works which we know Cato to have addressed to his son; instead these words are well suited to the agricultural section of the *Liber ad filium*, which was primarily concerned with running a profitable estate. It is not out of the question that Cato addressed his son on other occasions, and that some of these sayings came down to Plutarch in a collection, but this is needless speculation, given the good fit of the line within the *Liber* and its position

[345] Cf. Theopropides in Plautus' *Mostellaria* (l.636-40).

within Plutarch's biography amidst other citations from this work. The fragment is difficult to place exactly within the agricultural section of the *Liber ad filium*. As a general exhortation, rather than a specific direction, it is tempting to place this as part of an introduction or conclusion to Cato's agricultural advice, either to the section as a whole, or to a particular topic of discussion within it. After consideration, I have positioned it as the conclusion of this section as a whole. The strongly verbal character of the line makes a shift in tone to a rather higher register most suitable for a conclusion. The line's focus upon the increase in one's estate provides the overall goal for the agricultural advice contained here, naturally summarising the aims of the section as a whole, while the description of this estate as a legacy seems suitably final.

The lines operate as an excellent summary of Cato's approach to conducting one's business. His concern for creating a stable and substantial profit is made clear throughout the *De agricultura*;[346] while the significance which Cato placed on individually increasing one's patrimony and collectively maintaining a stable system of property classes can be seen in his speeches.[347] It is only too probable that these sentiments and the practices which promoted them played an important part in the *Liber ad filium*, too. The colourful imagery and clear hyperbole of these lines, employing the contrast between the circumstances of a widow (*ἀλλὰ χήρας γυναικός*) and a man (*οὐκ ἀνδρός*) to exhort his son to pursue further profit-driven activities is typical of Cato's oratorical style.[348] The strong verbal effect of these lines echoes that found above in F1 and it is possible that there were other similarly strong paternal

[346] Most notably in the preface, but also in proverbs such as, ' the *pater familias* ought to be a selling man, not a buying man,' (*patrem familias vendacem, non emacem esse oportet*); *Agr*. 2.7.
[347] Cato condemns the waste of one's inheritance at Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 8.11; Cato's opposition to the repeal of the *lex Orchia* (*ORF*$^3$ XXXV) and his support for the *lex Voconia* (*ORF*$^3$ XL) appears to be motivated by concerns over the dissolution and division of patrimony respectively. Terence's Demea exhibits similar attitudes (Ter. *Ad*. 812-4, 866, 868-9).
[348] For similar examples of hyperbole, we might consider Cato's 'carnivorous' king (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 8.13) and his 'hydra' of luxury (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 16.7).

indictments throughout the *Liber ad filium*. This fragment, once more, highlights the strong presence of generalities and aphorisms at different points within the *Liber*, showing the varied tone and colour of this interesting work.

There are several other fragments on the subject of the frugal agricultural life which have, at times, been attributed to the *Liber ad filium*. These fragments clearly reflect the same beliefs and teachings which are found in the *Liber* and would not be out of place within the work. One advises care when considering making a purchase: 'you should buy not what you need, but what is necessary; what you do not need, is expensive, even at a penny,' (*emas non quod opus est, sed quod necesse est; quod non opus est asse carum est*);[349] while another encourages self-reliance: 'what you lack, borrow from yourself,' (*quod tibi deerit, a te ipso mutuare*);[350] and another commends a serious engagement with agricultural production: '[Cato] thought that one ought to acquire lands for sowing and for pasture, rather than for sprinkling and sweeping,' (*ὤιετο δεῖν… κτᾶσθαι δὲ τὰ σπειρόμενα καὶ νεμόμενα μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ ῥαινόμενα καὶ σαιρόμενα*).[351] These statements thus extol the same values as this work and their aphoristic style would fit well with many of the passages discussed above. However, the very general terms of these expressions and the generalist manner in which they are quoted by their citing sources suggests that these fragments were not found within the *Liber ad filium*. The first two expressions, quoted by Seneca the Younger, are both described as one of 'those Catonians' (*illa Catoniana*),[352] a term which strongly suggests that they were cited from a collection of Catonian sayings, rather than directly from the *Liber ad filium*.[353] While it is, of course, possible that these sayings were excerpted from the *Liber*, it is more likely

[349] Sen. *Ep*. 94.27 = *Libri ad Marcum Filium* F10 J. = *Incertorum Librorum Fragmenta* F37 C.
[350] Sen. *Ben*. 5.7.6 = *Libri ad Marcum Filium* F13 J. = *Incertorum Librorum Fragmenta* F36 C.
[351] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 4.6 = *Libri ad Marcum Filium* F11 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F10 C.
[352] Sen. *Ep*. 94.27; *Ben*. 5.7.6.
[353] Cf. the terms *Montaniana* (Sen. *Controv*. 9.5.17) and *sententia Publiliana* (Sen. *Controv*. 7.3.8).

that they were taken from one of Cato's speeches. The general terms of their expression and wide application would be well suited to such a context. The saying preserved by Plutarch, similarly, has many hallmarks of Cato's oratorical style: the careful balance of the two phrases, 'sowing and pasture' and 'sprinkling and sweeping' (*τὰ σπειρόμενα καὶ νεμόμενα … τὰ ῥαινόμενα καὶ σαιρόμενα*), and the use of his own example to admonish his peers are both typical of the speeches. The subject of these lines, the appropriate use of agricultural land, also has strong connections with the censorial speeches. Furthermore, the citation of this expression in one of the early sections of Plutarch's biography, offering an initial sketch of Cato's character, strongly suggests that it came from one of his well known speeches, rather than from the *Liber ad filium*, which seems to have been used as a source only later on within Plutarch's account.[354] All things considered, these fragments have not been included in this edition; however, the existence of similar sentiments to those expressed in the *Liber ad filium* elsewhere within the Catonian corpus should alert us to the likelihood that Cato's works contained much repetition of content and the fact that many of the aphorisms and generalisations found in his practical works were likely to be returned to within his public speeches.

***De rhetorica***

**F. 18** orator est, Marce fili, vir bonus dicendi peritus

An orator, Marcus my son, is a good man and an experienced speaker.

Sen. *Controv.* 1. *praef.* 9

*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F14 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F18 C.

[354] See below p.259-60.

This fragment came to be widely regarded by the Romans as the basis for their definition of the orator, who ought to be a man, first and foremost, of good character. Cato's phrase is found, first of all, in the mouth of Antonius in Cicero's *De oratore*, who remarks that he will only encourage a talented youth to train as an orator, 'if he also seemed to me to be a good man' (*si vir quoque bonus mihi videbitur esse*).[355] The phrase was first cited directly in this capacity by Seneca, who quotes these words in the preface to his first book of *controversiae*. In a condemnation of his younger contemporaries, whom he deems to be worthless characters, and therefore bad orators, Seneca praises Cato's fine morals and the worth of his words on the orator, addressing his sons; 'you are mistaken, my most excellent young friends, if you do not believe this to be an utterance, not of Marcus Cato, but of an oracle. For what is an oracle? Surely it is the will of the gods announced on the lips of a man; and whom was the god able to find a better prophet than Marcus Cato, through whom not to instruct the human race, but to reprove it?' (*erratis, optimi iuvenes, nisi illam vocem non M. Catonis, sed oraculi creditis. Quid enim est oraculum? nempe voluntas divina hominis ore enuntiata; et quem antistitem sanctiorem sibi invenire divinitas potuit quam M. Catonem, per quem humano generi non praeciperet, sed convicium faceret?*).[356] For Seneca, Cato's definition provides an apt preface to the instruction offered to his own sons, the *Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae Divisiones Colores*, addressing their desire for a work on oratory, and, particularly, on the use of *sententiae*. Some years after Seneca, one Herennius Senecio goes a stage further in the use of Cato's phrase in condemnation of his contemporaries; he is quoted by Pliny as actually adapting it to define Regulus, a well known *delator*, as, 'an orator is a bad man and an inexperienced speaker.' (*orator est vir malus dicendi imperitus*).[357] Some years later, we find

[355] Cic. *De or*. 2.85.
[356] Sen. *Controv*. 1. *praef*. 9.
[357] Plin. *Ep*. 4.7.5. On the particular significance of Cato's phrase, in the context of the *delatores*, to Quintilian, see below, p.239-40.

that Quintilian also makes use of Cato's definition of the orator in the *Institutio oratoria*, a work of instruction which he, too, had intended for his sons. Quintilian declares his intentions within this treatise in a paraphrase of Cato's words: 'I will fix the standard for the perfect orator, who cannot exist but in a good man,' (*oratorem autem instituimus illum perfectum, qui esse nisi vir bonus non potest*).[358] Returning to Cato's phrase in the final book of the treatise, which focuses on the ideal orator on the completion of his education, Quintilian cites Cato's words in full: 'therefore, let the orator that I ordain be as the one defined by Marcus Cato, a good man and an experienced speaker; however as Cato states first, and as is naturally greater and more important, let him be above all a good man,' (*sit ergo nobis orator quem constituimus is qui a M. Catone finitur vir bonus dicendi peritus, verum, id quod et ille posuit prius et ipsa natura potius ac maius est, utique vir bonus*).[359] Quintilian has, in Cato's words, the perfect expression of all that he is trying to achieve in the *Institutio oratoria* and he is careful to place this aim before his audience at crucial points within the treatise.[360]

Several later writers on rhetoric also use Cato's expression as their definition of the orator. Fortunatianus opens his work on the art of rhetoric with these words, 'what is an orator? A good man and an experienced speaker,' (*quid est orator? vir bonus dicendi peritus*);[361] Cassiodorus also opens his discussion on rhetoric with the dictum, 'an orator, therefore, is a good man and an experienced speaker, as the saying goes, in civil inquiries,' (*orator igitur est vir bonus dicendi peritus, ut dictum est, in civilibus quaestionibus*);[362] while Isidorus calls upon Cato's words at the start of his discussion on the same subject.[363]

[358] Quint. *Inst*. 1 *praef*. 9.
[359] Quint. *Inst*. 12.1.1.
[360] On the wider philosophical implcations of Quintilian's use of the term, see below p.240-2.
[361] Fortunat. *Rhet*. *Lat*. *Min* p.81 l.5 Halm.
[362] Cassiod. *Inst*. 2.2.1.
[363] Isid. *Etym*. 2.3.1.

Servius also invokes Cato's definition of the orator to help illuminate the *Aeneid*'s programmatic first simile – Neptune's calming of the winds, as a respected orator calms an unruly crowd:[364] 'and here this definition of rhetoric is useful, which attributes to it justice and experience in speaking, just as does 'then, esteemed by virtue of his reverence' and 'he governed their tempers with his speech'. For an orator is a good man and an experienced speaker,' (*et bene servat circa hunc rhetoricam definitionem, cui dat et iustitiam et peritiam dicendi, ut 'tum pietate gravem' et 'ille regit dictis animos'. orator enim est vir bonus, dicendi peritus*).[365] Servius' citation of Cato's definition here shows a remarkable reapplication of the words, away from a didactic work offering instruction in oratory, instead applying them to a fictional character, and using them to illustrate the weight and worth that a good orator once held. Fronto, too, adapts Cato's phrase, applying it to the personal circumstances of his addressee: 'what you sought in every prayer, you have: a firm and resolute brother, 'a good man and an experienced speaker',' (*quin, quod votis omnibus expetisti, habes fratrem fortem, 'virum bonum dicendi peritum'*).[366] The frequency with which these words were cited as a starting point for works on oratory suggests that they were widely taken to be the basis for any definition offered of an orator. Alongside these quotations, the diverse reworkings and reapplications of the phrase demonstrate a wide acceptance of, and ready familiarity with the contents of this definition. The popularity of these words – they are cited by a greater number of writers and more frequently than any other fragment from the works which Cato addressed to his son – is a consequence of the importance of Cato the Censor to Roman oratory, of the importance of oratory to Roman political life, and of the importance of political oratory to Roman identity.

[364] Verg. *Aen*. 1.148-53.
[365] Serv. *Comm. in Verg. Aen*. 1.151.
[366] Fronto, *Ep*. p.115 l.22-4 VdH.

The content of this line proposes a new topic, not yet treated in the *Liber ad filium*, oratory. This subject makes up the third section of the work as we have it and represents, alongside medicine and agriculture, another important area of expertise for the *pater familias*. We have testimony in Quintilian that Cato wrote on the subject of rhetoric, 'Marcus Cato was the first Roman, as far as I myself know, to compose something on this subject,' (*Romanorum primus, quantum ego quidem sciam, condidit aliqua in hanc materiam M. Cato*),[367] and, in the absence of any other appropriate venue for his work on the subject, it is reasonable to assume that Cato dedicated a section of his *Liber ad filium* to instructing Licinianus in rhetoric.[368] The present fragment appears to come from a prefatory passage introducing this new subject, and hence it has been positioned first in this section. The phrase has parallels with the beginnings of the *Liber*'s sections on both medicine and agriculture. The prominent address to Licinianus as *Marce fili* is found in the prefaces to both of these portions of the work; the invocation of the figure of the *vir bonus* is present in the introduction to Cato's section on agriculture; while the oracular tone of this fragment recalls the opening of the work's initial section on medicine.[369] The presentative use of *esse*, elevated tone and the generalised nature of the sentiment expressed here all suggest that this line was part of a preface of some kind. Indeed, the statement seems an apt basis upon which to build further advice on the composition of good oratory. The pattern of this line's citation, frequently found in the openings of later works, also suggests that it enjoyed a prominent position, possibly first

[367] Quint. *Inst*. 3.1.19.

[368] There are a range of scholarly perspectives on Cato's treatment of rhetoric; Astin is reluctant to see the topic as treated in its own right within the *Liber ad filium* ((1978) 333-4); Calboli is more inclined to include the subject here, though he also highlights the *Apophthegmata* as a suitable location for such a discussion ((1981) 43-4); while Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi, following Jordan's original edition, place a section on rhetoric within the *Liber ad filium* (2001). I am inclined to follow their decision; Quintilian's description of Cato's treatment of rhetoric, *aliqua in hanc materiam*, clearly rules out a large scale discussion of the topic, but would be a good fit for a short selection of practical directions found as part of a longer work. Quintilian's testimony, strengthened by the suitability of the content and verbal similarities to the rest of the *Liber* form good grounds for placing these fragments here.

[369] It is possible that Cato may even have framed the utterance as vatic within his text: this would be an apt basis for Seneca's description of the phrase as oracular (Sen. *Controv*. 1. *praef*. 9).

place in this section of the *Liber ad filium*. This order is widely employed in editions on Cato and it is maintained here.[370]

The content of this fragment builds carefully upon that of F6, which introduced the *Liber*'s section on agriculture with the phrase, 'A good man, Marcus my son, is an experienced husbandman, whose tools shine,' (*vir bonus est, Marce fili, colendi peritus, cuius ferramenta splendent*). In the present fragment, Cato offers his son a definition not of a 'good man' (*vir bonus*), but rather of 'an orator' (*orator est*); however, he claims that an orator must, in fact, be a 'good man', and he goes on to use the same adjective + gerund formula to describe his key attribute – just as the good man must be 'an experienced husbandman' (*colendi peritus*), so the orator must be 'an experienced speaker' (*dicendi peritus*).[371] The latter fragment thus builds carefully on the former, seemingly implying that, since only an experienced farmer can be a good man, and only a good man can be an orator, only those who have a background in husbandry can be orators. This pattern of development – farmer > morally upright man > orator – mirrors Cato's own career trajectory in a way which cannot be coincidental. The close verbal parallels between these two sentences strongly suggest that they were intended to be read in tandem, and this reading emphatically affirms Cato's personal virtue and his oratorical skill, the pillars upon which he built his political success. This unique formula for an orator also allows Cato to defame, in contrast, his rivals, not only for their poor morals, but also for their poor oratory. In this fragment, then, we see a further example of Cato instructing his son on the basis of his own experience and encouraging the youth to construct his career after the pattern of his father.

[370] Jordan (1860); Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001).
[371] It is notable that Cato insists on oratorical skill learnt through practical experience (*dicendi peritus*), rather than through academic training, of which he emphatically disapproved; see Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23.2.

The phrase has a distinct ethical emphasis, exhibiting concern that the orator be a man of good morals. This was a charge regularly made of skilled professionals, who had the power to grossly misuse their arts to widespread harm, if they were so inclined. Cato exhibits a similar concern for the morals of doctors in the first fragment of this work, where he rejects Greek medical professionals on the grounds that they were from a race that was 'utterly worthless and impossible to improve,' (*nequissimum et indocile*).[372] Later citations of Cato's phrase all continue this use of the phrase *vir bonus* to describe a man of good character; however, in these later authors we often find that a variety of wider implications are also at work. For Cicero, Seneca, and Quintilian, the *vir bonus* can have particular political, as well as philosophical, notably Stoic, resonances.[373] Nonetheless, both in the case of Cato himself, and in the instances of those who redeployed his words, this phrase was not employed in a technical capacity. It is more likely, then, that Cato's words articulate a traditional ideal, widely recognised as good common sense.

Cato's concerns for the moral worth of the orator may also have had a particular political emphasis. The Censor's anger at the amoral oratorical instruction offered by Carneades, who reportedly taught his pupils to argue for justice on one day and against it on the following, suggests that he felt keenly the need for the state's orators to be men who would steer her on a good and upright course.[374] These concerns set this line very much in the pattern of the *Liber*; its moral and ethical emphasis - which may well have a wider eye to politics, its practical and paternal nature, and its generalised, even oracular tone, are all seen consistently throughout this text.

[372] F1. See also Reinhardt and Winterbottom (2006) xlv.
[373] Cicero presents the *vir bonus* in the strict, Stoic sense at *Fin.* 3.76 and *Tusc.* 5.28, but he uses the term in a broad ethical-political sense at *De or.* 2.25, 144, 208, 260, and goes some way to contrast these usages at *Amic.* 18-21. The idea of the Stoic sage was present to both Seneca and especially Quintilian, on whom, see below p.240-2.
[374] On Cato's disapproval of Carneades, see Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22; Plin. *HN* 7.112. On the political emphasis of his concern for the orator as *vir bonus*, see Calboli (1981) 47-8; Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001) *ad loc.*

**F. 19** rem tene, verba sequentur

Grasp the matter, the words will follow.

Julius Victor *Rhet. Lat. Min.* p.374 l.16ff Halm
*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F15 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F19 C.

Despite being a commonplace of discussions of oratory, well known and widely cited during the classical era, these words are first recorded in their full form by Julius Victor, a 4th century writer of rhetoric of probable Gallic origin. Victor cites this saying in the first section of his work on rhetoric, *De Inventione*; proposing that the best position from which to expand and elaborate one's case was a sure knowledge of its central facts, he quotes a series of authors to reinforce his point. Victor then cites from Cicero, Socrates, and, finally, Cato: 'in agreement on this subject is a saying, almost inspired, of Cato, who says...' (*in hanc rem constat etiam Catonis praeceptum paene divinum, qui ait...*). While Victor's is the first verbatim citation of Cato's precept, it appears to have been a familiar teaching from an early date. Cicero reworks this expression at the start of his *De oratore*, claiming that knowledge of a whole range of subjects is the source of good oratory: 'for it is out of knowledge that oratory ought to flower and to flow,' (*etenim ex rerum cognitione efflorescat et redundet oportet oratio*).[375] We are told by the commentator Porphyrio that Asinius Pollio adapted the phrase: 'and Asinius Pollio said the same thing,' (*et Asinius Pollio idem dixit*) by the commentator. Pollio's rather tongue in cheek version of Cato's aphorism, 'it might bloody well turn out badly for the words, if they do not follow the matter at issue,' (*male Hercule eveniat verbis nisi rem sequuntur*), suggests that the phrase was rather over-used in the

[375] Cic. *De or*. 1.20.

rhetorical teachings of his day.[376] Horace also reworks the saying in his *Ars Poetica*, applying it to the writing of verse: 'wisdom is the beginning and source of writing well. Socratic scrolls can show you the subject, and the words will follow, not unwillingly, upon the subject foreseen,' (*scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons. / rem tibi Socraticae poterunt ostendere chartae, / uerbaque prouisam rem non inuita sequentur*).[377] It is found again, in a rhetorical context, in Fortunatianus: 'I will stick exclusively to the matters in hand, then to these I will fit words as the occasion allows,' (*res ipsas tenebimus solas, dehinc his verba de tempore accommodabimus*).[378] The diverse references that we find to Cato's teaching, often reworked and reapplied to a novel context, demonstrate just how familiar his phrase had become – it was easily recognisable and its advice was both accepted and felt to be widely applicable.[379] Indeed, the passages cited relate Cato's teaching to oratorical theory and to philosophy, ideas which are unlikely to have been present in this passage of the *Liber ad filium*, but to which it was felt that these words had relevance.

Victor presents these words as a 'a saying, almost inspired, of Cato,' (*Catonis praeceptum paene divinum*) without attributing them to a particular work.[380] The content of the line fits well within a work on rhetoric, detailing the primary principle upon which a speech ought to be constructed, which strongly suggests that it should be placed within this section of the *Liber ad filium*.[381] Victor's description of this line as a 'saying' (*praeceptum*) and as one that

[376] Porph. *ad Hor*. *Artem P*. 311. It seems likely that Cato's phrase had become something of a slogan for the Atticists – effectively encapsulating their preference for brevity. Indeed, Cicero recommended Cato as a model for Roman Atticists, lamenting their lack of appreciation for the author, which he contrasts with his own extensive knowledge (Cic. *Brut*. 65-9); it seems that such superficial knowledge might have led to the overuse of famous phrases such as this one in 1st century BC debate and discussion about rhetorical styles. For further discussion, see Calboli (1975) 51-103.
[377] Hor. *Ars P*. 309-11.
[378] Fortunat. *Rhet*. *Lat*. *Min*. p.129 l.26 Halm.
[379] Calboli (1981) 45.
[380] Julius Victor *Rhet*. *Lat*. *Min*. p.374 l.16-7Halm.
[381] Some scholars have interpreted the *res* of this sentence as referring to specific judicial formulae, and hence have seen the fragment as originating from Cato's treatise on civil law; see Guarino (1985) 133-42. This very narrow interpretation of the passage is rather difficult to assimilate with the close connection this fragment

is ‘almost inspired’ (*paene divinum*) also suggests that the *Liber*, which featured frequent aphorisms interspersed amongst its technical directions and which made claims to oracular utterance, provided the original context for this line. This citation has been placed after F18, which appears to have come from the preface to this section, but before Fs 20 and 21, which appear to derive from this line. Indeed, the saying quoted here appears to introduce a general principle on oratory which is then followed by a longer discussion detailing the application of this advice.

This citation offers advice, at a most basic level, on how to compose a speech.[382] The generalisation has the appearance of the beginning of a practical guide to the task, helping the young orator, as it does, to identify what to include in his oration as he embarks upon its composition. The practical nature of this direction, which, like so much of the *Liber ad filium*, is targeted and tailored to the needs of its recipient, should not surprise us. Cato’s concern for clear and accurate knowledge of a subject, typically garnered at first hand, is evident in both the exhaustive detail of the *De agricultura* and in the careful research of the *Origines*. The focus which he recommends upon fully understanding the concerns of one’s case and taking these as the first point of one’s speech, is thus very much in accordance with his own methods and values, and, indeed, is evident in Cato’s own oratorical works.[383] The

exhibits to the preceding one and to this portion of the *Liber* in general, as well as rather risky, given how little we know of Cato’s legal works.

[382] The content of the rhetorical section of the *Liber ad filium* appears to have been practical, rather than theoretical in emphasis. Quintilian’s description of the tradition of rhetorical treatises in Latin, which he notes M. Antonius to have begun (*M. Antonius [ille censorius] inchoavit*), strongly suggests that Cato’s treatment of the subject was not theoretical in nature (Quint. *Inst.* 3.1.19). Furthermore, such theoretical discussion would be starkly different from the practical nature of the directions found in the other sections of the *Liber ad filium*. It would also contradict Plutarch’s account of Cato’s opposition to theoretical training in oratory (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23.2). Indeed, it is possible that the practical directions on oratory given here were designed as part of a deliberate rejection of rhetorical theory. At any rate, Calboli is clearly correct in his comment that this section of the *Liber*, ‘fu un’ opera più da iniziatore che da vero tecnico della retorica’ ((1981) 44).

[383] Cato’s oration *Pro Rhodiensibus*, for example, displays a clear focus upon the central question of whether or not the Rhodians did, in fact lend assistance to Perses; Cato is eager to set aside all emotion that might occlude the facts of the case (*ORF*[3] 163); to put down any prejudices the jury may have against the Rhodians’ character (*ORF*[3] 169); and he is emphatic in his distinction between word and action in his definition of the crime – the

direct and truthful speech and brevity in diction which are a natural consequence of this concern feature in the following fragments, which appear to detail and develop the sentiments expressed here.[384] This teaching, then, comes from the heart of the Censor's own values and experience, the source of so much of his son's instruction. While this citation has been worked into contexts of oratorical theory and of philosophical discussions of knowledge, there is no suggestion of this in Cato's words. Indeed, the saying found in this fragment, and the discussion of its terms found in those which follow, is overwhelmingly practical; providing a generous basis of instruction for a young orator, this useful principle was possibly elaborated with examples, and was certainly expanded with applicable details, all from the wealth of Cato's own practical experience.

**F. 20** ergo factum solum negotium est; propositio facti cum persona vel quolibet alio modo invidiam conparans aut extenuans summa dicetur. et haec est, quam Cato in libro suo appellat 'vires causae'.

Thus the fact alone is the object of consideration; the exposition of the fact, either with the character involved, or by whatever other means, rousing or lessening resentment, will be called the crucial point; and this is what Cato calls 'the essence of the case' in his book.

*Incertus Auctor Rhet. Lat. Min.* p.308 l.23ff Halm
*Libri ad Marcum Filium* F16 J. = *ad Marcum Filium* F20 C.

The author of this treatise here enumerates the different elements which make up a criminal case. He offers a variety of different ways of categorising the material which a forensic speech should cover, before summarising these as two distinct types of discussion. The

Rhodians' wishes to oppose the Romans cannot render them guilty of a crime that they did not actually commit (*ORF*[3] 167)
[384] Fs 20, 21.

distinction used is between a 'fact' (*factum*) and an 'exposition of the fact' (*propositio facti*). The author explains that the 'fact' is one of the factual points pertaining directly to the charge itself: 'therefore, each single point of which either the defendant is accused, or which are asked about the defendant are the facts,' (*singula igitur quaeque, quae homini aut obiciuntur aut de homine quaeruntur, facta sunt*);[385] by contrast, other circumstantial details, such as the character of the figure involved, form part of the 'exposition of the fact' (*propositio facti*).[386] He invokes Cato as having termed these two types of discussion as the 'strengths of the case' (*vires causae*), lending his own treatment of the material the legitimacy that comes by right of Cato's oratorical prowess. The author of this treatise does not attribute this classification to any particular work of Cato, but simply to 'his book' (*libro suo*); however, the context of the citation, amidst a discussion of forensic oratory, and the content of these lines, classifying different types of material in such speeches, clearly place the citation in the rhetorical section of the *Liber ad filium*. The citation most likely originates from the discussion following on from F19, expanding the content of this pithy aphorism with further details and distinctions useful in the task of composing oratory.[387]

The distinction identified here between 'fact' and 'exposition of the fact' is traced by the author back to Cato. These two elements, 'the essences of the case' as the Censor termed them, are apt to be identified with the terms of F19; it seems that the 'fact' forms 'the matter' (*res*), and the 'exposition of the fact' forms the 'words [that] will follow' (*verba sequentur*), as set out above. These lines suggest, then, that after opening this section of the *Liber* with a pithy aphorism, Cato went on to explain and expand upon the terms of this saying. In this case, he appears to have detailed the type of material that constituted the *res* that he instructed his son to understand fully and to focus upon, and the type of material that constituted the

[385] Incert. Auct. *Rhet. Lat. Min.* p.307 l.36 – p.308 l.1 Halm.
[386] Incert. Auct. *Rhet. Lat. Min.* p.308 l.23ff Halm.
[387] As Calboli has observed ((1981) 42).

*verba* which would flow naturally on from this *res*. These descriptions would help Licinianus to understand this distinction, to apply it in context, and to construct a speech in accordance with the principle of *rem tene, verba sequentur*. In terming these two classes of material the *vires causae*, Cato summarises the essentials of the forensic speech in a simple and memorable term. The directions offered in this section of the *Liber*, then, seem to form a practical and useful guide for a beginner putting together forensic speeches for the first time. This characteristic of the work may well reflect its origins as part of Licinianus' education. The distinction between these two *vires causae* can be seen as operative in Cato's own oratorical works; these typically focus on the issue contested, for example, whether or not the Rhodians had lent their support to Antiochus, before filling this out with further relevant details from the situation, for example, on why the Rhodians may have wished to support Antiochus and Rome's attitudes towards her new position within the Mediterranean.[388] This clear focus on what pertains directly and indirectly to the case lends all of Cato's speeches their famed brevity and clarity. In these lines, then, we see Cato once more instructing his son with practical direction based on his own skills and experiences. The content of this citation suggests that Cato fleshed out the aphorism used to introduce this topic, following his exhortation to *rem tene, verba sequentur* with further discussion detailing how to apply this general principle. This may well have been a structure which he used repeatedly within the *Liber ad filium*. These lines, thus, demonstrate something of the careful construction of the *Liber*, a work whose design exhibits concerns for its utility, variety, and didactic authority.

**F. 21** in familiaribus litteris primo brevitas observanda: ipsarum quoque sententiarum ne diu circumferatur, quod Cato ait, ambitio, sed ita recidantur, ut numquam verbi aliquid deesse videatur.

[388] *ORF*[3] XLII.

In letters to friends brevity should be observed in the first instance; also, let no wandering train of thought be carried on for a long time, as Cato says, but let phrases be abbreviated in such a way that not a word ever appears to be missing.

Julius Victor *Rhet. Lat. Min.* p.448 l.1ff Halm
*ad Marcum Filium* F21 C.

These lines are part of Julius Victor's discussion of epistolary writing, in which he recommends this brief and direct style for the writing of letters on private matters to friends and acquaintances. Victor makes use of the Censor's authority to endorse his advice, stating that Cato advised against lengthy expressions of a confused or unsystematic nature. He appears to borrow his term for these tedious phrases directly from Cato, describing them as a 'wandering train of thought' (*sententiarum ambitio*).[389] Victor does not attribute these words to a particular work of Cato's, but their discussion of style, and specifically of brevity, connects them to this section of the *Liber ad filium* in general, and to F19 in particular. It is notable here that Victor takes Cato's oratorical advice and reapplies it to a rather different, epistolary context. This diverse reapplication suggests that Cato's exhortations to brevity had become something of a commonplace, easily taken from their original context, while still maintaining good sense and clear value. Victor's manipulation of Cato's instruction thus highlights how well known sections of the *Liber ad filium* had become and how widely associated Cato and his works were with brevity of expression. This description appears to have been part of the discussion which followed on from Cato's saying, *rem tene, verba sequentur*; its recommendation of brevity and avoidance of lengthy expression appears to derive from the ideal of directness and clarity upheld by this aphorism. It has therefore been

[389] Julius Victor *Rhet. Lat. Min.* p.448 l.1ff Halm.

placed as part of the sequence of citations which develop from F19, although there is no clear way in which to determine an exact order for these fragments.

The advice attributed to Cato here recommends the avoidance of long and meandering expressions and promotes, instead, the use of short and direct phrases. It also upholds the need for clarity and comprehensibility on all points. The nature of this advice, with its focus not only on what is to be encouraged, but also on what should be avoided in oratory, and with its awareness of common pitfalls in pursuing this direction, suggests that Cato detailed and developed the saying with which this section opens at some length. It also suggests that this development may have involved examples, possibly taken from rival orators, of lengthy and cumbersome phrasing, as well as practical warnings of problems of which to be mindful.[390] This final fragment, then, is full of the practical and technical instruction which we have come to expect of the *Liber ad filium*; its clear and careful development from the opening aphorism at F19 shows something of the detailed level of structured discussion of which Cato was capable, as well as reminding us of the varied colour and tone displayed by this text throughout.

Each of the citing sources that specifies their quotation of Cato as taken from this work does so in a slightly different way. The address to Licinianus which is found in F1, 6, 13, and 18, was felt to be the work's most distinctive feature, and is mentioned by all of these sources, typically as 'to his son' (*ad filium*). This address is often coupled with another piece of

[390] Cato had previously demonstrated his own brevity of speech and the clarity of the Latin language by declining to speak Greek as part of a Roman embassy in Athens; Cato's own speech in Latin thus contrasted starkly with the lengthy circumlocutions used by his Greek interpreters (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 12.5). Roman brevity (on which, see Sall. *Hist*. 4) appears to derive from the laconic qualities of the Spartans (Pl. *Prt*. 342d-2), via the Sabines (on the Sabines as the descendants of the Spartans, see below p.197 n.189). As such, Cato's gesture may have not only Roman, but also distinctly Sabine overtones. See also Moretti (1995) 80 n.22.

information about the work, either describing its form (*in praeceptis*, *in libro*, *in libris*, *in epistula*, *in oratione*), or its subject matter (*de oratore*, *de agri cultura*). The variety of these different appellations for the work strongly suggests that it had no clear title given to it, either by Cato himself, or by a later editor.[391] Instead, each of these descriptions highlights a different feature of the work - one of the topics which it treats, its didactic nature, epistolary character, its book form - and often a feature which is particularly pertinent to the fragment quoted. These descriptions not only provide us with further information about the text itself, but they also suggest some of the ways in which the text was read and edited. Most notably, the repeated use of the *ad* + addressee formula suggests that this text came to be read and edited as a collection of letters.[392] The formula is well attested as a title for other ancient letter collections, most notably those of Cicero, whose *Epistulae ad Atticum*, *Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem*, and *Epistulae ad Familiares* are well known under these titles from an early date.[393] Cicero's letter collections make a very productive parallel for the *Liber ad filium*; the works of both authors are made up of practically oriented material on a variety of topics and directed to a particular addressee.[394] While it is difficult to maintain that the *Liber* was composed, or circulated as a series of letters to Licinianus by Cato himself, it is easy to see how the work came to be read in this way.[395] The epistolary colour of the text – its prominent addressee not least, but also its didactic emphasis, short length, and varied subject matter - the

[391] This was not unusual for an ancient text, particularly one written at such an early stage of Latin literature. Most ancient literary works, in the absence of a title chosen by the author, were designated by their opening words (for a brief collection of evidence for this, see Gratwick (1991); on the variety of different arrangements of these words found and problems that these 'titles' can present, see Pitcher (2009) 2-4). While it is possible that Cato opened the *Liber ad filium* with the words *ad filium*, this seems unlikely, and an alternative explanation for this designation for the text is offered below.

[392] The *ad* + addressee formula was also often found at the opening of letters, which named the recipient of the missive in this format.

[393] On the publication of Cicero's letters, see Shackleton-Bailey (1965-8) vol. 1, 59-76. Both Nepos and Seneca refer to the letters to Atticus in this way (Nep. *Att*. 16.2-4; Sen. *Ep*. 97.40), while the title *Epistulae ad Familiares* does not appear on manuscripts until the Renaissance (indeed, it has been argued that the title given to Cicero's work was in emulation of Petrarch's work of the same name (Hinds (2004)).

[394] They differ from Seneca's *Epistulae Morales* and Pliny's *Epistulae*, letters that were literary in nautre (or at least worked up for publication) in a way that Cicero's were not. Notably, neither Pliny's nor Seneca's letters are referred to with this *ad* + addressee formula.

[395] On the form of the work, see below p.128-31.

possibility that the *Liber* was edited alongside Cato's *Epistulae*;[396] and the popularity of the letter form in late antiquity and the willingness of writers of this period to describe all sorts of works as letters,[397] all promote the reading of Cato's work as a collection of letters. This reading is, in turn, likely to have given us the popular *ad filium* description of the text.

The absence of a clear title for this text given by Cato himself certainly doesn't imply that it was not carefully crafted or intended for a wider circulation. The varied appellations given to the work perfectly encapsulate Cato's paradigmatic relationship with his son, his involvement in the boy's instruction, and the skills and practical knowledge employed in this, the display of which appears to have been the purpose behind the circulation of this text. The varied references made to the *Liber*, therefore, provide evidence for its success as a published piece of political strategy, and do not necessarily imply that the work was a private or unpublished matter.

In consequence of the variety of the descriptions of the work found in our citing sources I have entitled it here as the *Liber ad filium*; this continues the prominence given to Licinianus by the sources, whilst remaining as neutral as possible on the wider tone, form and content of the work as a whole, which are more difficult to pin down. Given these general uncertainties about the work it is perhaps best not to invest too heavily in any one title for the *Liber*.

There are difficulties in dating the *Liber ad filium* and little direct evidence on which to base a putative date for the work's composition or circulation. I have argued above that, given the practical origin of Cato's writings in general, the prominent address to Licinianus in the work places the composition of the text in relationship to his early life and educational

[396] On this possibility, see below p.145-6.
[397] Morello and Morrison (2007) 228.

development.[398] Evidence also suggests that Cato publicised his involvement in his son's education, and so the circulation of the *Liber ad filium*, at a relatively early date, during, or shortly after the completion of that education, would sit very well within this public demonstration of his paternal devotion. While the work's composition, then, is likely to have been a process of gathering elements found to be valuable in the instruction of his son from his household notes, which may well have taken place at any point over the length of Licinianus' young life, it seems appropriate to make use of this biographical connection to estimate a more precise date for the circulation of the text. In order for Cato to maximise the value of the connection between this work, his son, and his success as a father, the *Liber* would need to have been circulated once Licinianus had completed, or very nearly completed, his education under Cato and had been seen publicly to have done so successfully. This moment probably fell on or shortly after his assumption of the *toga virilis* and before he embarked upon military service, a period in which the youth would start to engage more actively with public life, thus suggesting a date between 175-6.[399] This date would also fall within the period of intense prosecution which followed Cato's censorship – the text thus providing a reminder of his excellent paternal qualities and practical skills.[400] It would also come within Cato's old age, making good sense of the boasts which he makes about his longevity in the work's opening.[401] Most scholars are also happy to attribute a relatively early date to the work, seeing it as an early experiment in didactic writing, an impression which is certainly borne out by the fragments.[402] Therefore, while it is not possible to pinpoint an

[398] See above p.21-2. Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi also date the work to around 180-175 on the grounds that it would be of most relevance to Licinianus at this point ((1996) 194).
[399] There is some evidence for a tradition of presenting youths with an educational work, as though a prize, on the assumption of their *toga virilis*, and it is possible that the *Liber ad filium* was presented to Licinianus in this way around 176-5. On the dedication of a work by a tutor to his tutee at this age, see Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 1.
[400] See below p.190-1.
[401] See above p.68 n.220.
[402] Both Kienast ((1954) 107) and Cornell ((2013) 36) see the *Liber* as an early, elementary treatment of topics to which Cato later returned in the *De agricultura* and the *De Medicina*. Those scholars who do see the *Liber* as a late text take the work's encyclopaedic scope, thought to encapsulate a lifetime of knowledge, as the basis for this. On the discrediting of this theory, see above p.29-35.

exact date, or even a particular period for the composition of the *Liber ad filium*, a process which is likely to have been protracted in nature, I believe that there is enough evidence to propose a date of the mid 170s for the probable circulation of the work.

The content of the work is far easier to comment upon. The focus of the *Liber ad filium* appears to have been on instructing Licinianus in the practical knowledge and moral qualities necessary to successfully run his own household.[403] All of the work's extant fragments pertain to topics of importance for the *pater familias* and many of these display an attempt to tailor the content of their instruction towards a young man of limited experience in this role. This instruction, overwhelmingly, was the product of Cato's own practical experience and the text itself seems to have been derived from the notes which he used in managing his own household. Thus we find selective and summative phrases which give the impression of abbreviating a much longer discussion, as well as an amount of overlap in content and, at times, uncertainty in attribution, between the *Liber ad filium* and the *De agricultura*. While the technical material shared between the *Liber* and Cato's wider technical treatises is of a similar nature, there appear to be other strategic differences between these texts. The address to Licinianus, and the shape of the advice aimed so particularly at him, separates the *Liber* quite distinctly from the host of other technical and didactic works written by the Censor. Alongside this, the work's many verbal elements – its high proportion of sayings and aphorisms - also set the *Liber* apart from these other texts.[404] While these verbal elements are not absent from works such as the *De agricultura*, they appear to be more prominent within the *Liber ad filium*, where they can be attributed to the work's origins in the oral instruction which Licinianus received from his father.

[403] The dual focus of this work could be spoken of, with an eye to modern educational literature, in terms of a focus upon 'skills' and 'content', both elements seen as essential parts of the valued 'cognitive approach' of courses in higher education; see Toohey (1999) 55-9.

[404] Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi also highlight the memorable qualities of the precepts found in the *Liber*, which it is possible to interpret as a deliberate didactic design ((1996) 194).

The *Liber* exhibits no small skill in the selection and structuring of its content. The work appears to have been in three parts, focusing upon medicine, agriculture, and rhetoric.[405] While the work may have treated other topics, these do not appear to have been of interest to our sources, who do not cite any of their content.[406] All of the extant sections of the *Liber* appear to have had some kind of a prefatory passage introducing the new topic, followed by technical material, interspersed with aphorisms. It is tempting to see these sayings, which are often in the form a generalised summary, as introducing the different sub-sections of technical material, but there is not sufficient evidence to be sure of this. The three topics treated may well have had a careful internal structure, discussing different points in turn; something of this structure has been created in this edition, although it is difficult to be sure if Cato's work displayed this level of organisation.[407] We can be more certain that the work as a whole had a relatively defined overall structure and design.

The tone of the work is subject to regular shifts and appears to have been remarkably varied.[408] The fragments display material which is dry and technical alongside pithy aphorisms, oracular utterances, traditional wisdom, acerbic criticism, hyperbole, and even parody. The personality of the Censor lies strongly behind all of these alternations in tone, reflecting his practical experience, traditional posturing, and his keen wit.[409] These shifts of

[405] On the three part structuring, see Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (1996) 193; (2001) 75-6. Other scholars have cast doubt over this structure, notably Astin, who argues for a very loose structure ((1978) 332-40), and Mazzarino, who sees the work as largely about agriculture ((1952) 19-30).
[406] As table 2 above shows, the majority of fragments from the *Liber ad filium* were cited for their content, which suggests that we have a relatively even representation of the work.
[407] Some parallels with the *De agricultura* suggest that a loose ordering to the technical material was likely; the early treatment of the purchase of land, followed by planting, and concerns of household manangerment, for example, seems probable.
[408] Some scholars have even seen the work as 'una specie di satura', see Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (1996) 193ff, (2001) *ad* F1, 64 n.308, 77-8.
[409] The extant fragments of Cato's speeches show that he spoke frequently about his practical experience of agriculture (*ORF*$^3$ 128), of command (*ORF*$^3$ IV), and of religious rites (*ORF*$^3$ 73); that he portrayed himself as a

tone create the impression of a work which has its origins in verbal instruction, delivered as the appropriate moment presented itself, with all the shifts of mood and changes in tack and topic that we might expect from this. The variety which this then brings to the work has made the *Liber* a fascinating product, full of short, quotable segments, and an eclectic variety of voices and opinions. The different tones of the *Liber ad filium*, then, are not an accident of poor planning, or necessarily an attempt at lively artistry, but seem to reflect something of a lived education under the guidance of a rich personality.

The exact form of the *Liber* remains elusive and questions of genre are very difficult to pin down:[410] the extant fragments from the work are too slight to give either much indication of the form of the whole or any sense of its generic affiliations; the sources which describe the *Liber* do so in varied expressions, which are largely based upon later editions and collections containing the work, rather than on its original form. Scholars have attempted to define the work variously as an encyclopaedia,[411] an encyclopaedic epistle,[412] a series of open letters,[413] a didactic treatise,[414] and a didactic treatise with a distinct epistolary preface.[415] While some of these proposed forms are more likely than others, there is no way to narrow these proposals down to a single, conclusive prescription for the form of the *Liber*.

---

modern representation of ancestral values (*ORF*$^{3}$ 206); and that he made ready use of humour in his speeches, recounting amusing anecdotes (*ORF*$^{3}$ 172), making puns (*ORF*$^{3}$ 151), and insulting jokes (*ORF*$^{3}$ 80).

[410] Gruen comes to similar conclusions, stating that, 'the search for form and genre encounters frustration', ((1992) 77).

[411] See above p.30 n.79.

[412] Schmidt (1972) argued for this form, an argument which derivative of the, now discredited, encyclopaedia theory.

[413] Gratwick (1982) 143, 145, 827.

[414] Most modern scholars attribute a loose didactic form to the work, see Mazzarino (1952); Astin (1978); Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001); some go further, seeing the *Liber* as a technical didactic treatise, see LeMoine (1991).

[415] Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (1996) 195. The opening structure of the *Liber ad filium* has been seen as a precursor to the prefatory epistle that is often found at the start of technical prose treatises, especially those on medical topics, in later Latin literature, see LeMoine (1991). On the epistolary preface in general, see Janson (1964) 106-12; on it being a feature of medical texts in particular, see Morello and Morrison (2007) 211-234.

There are, nevertheless, some certainties about the text: it was a short and slight work, instructional and technically oriented for the most part, but also featuring a prominent addressee, a degree of literary polish, and a variety of verbal sayings steeped in traditional wisdom. The *Liber ad filium* thus belongs amidst the loose and rather eclectic range of Cato's didactic texts. These vary from technical treatises, like the *De agricultura*, to collections of moral exhortations, such as the *Carmen de moribus*, to instruction carefully coupled with *exempla*, as found in the *De re militari*, to the accusatory admonitions of the speeches, and historical lessons of the *Origines*.[416] These different manifestations of didacticism suggest that Cato did not feel that his instruction needed to be tied to a particular literary form or convention, a reflection of the early and experimental stage of Latin literature in which he was writing.[417] In the *Liber*, as in many of his works, Cato is clearly aware of Greek literary texts on the topics that he treats, and here he even seeks to establish his own text in parallel to those of his Hellenic predecessors.[418] However, Cato does not at any point claim to create a tradition equivalent to that of the Greeks or to establish a new genre in Latin.[419] It seems unlikely, then, that Cato would have felt himself to be writing in a particular genre and to term his text as 'didactic' in this sense thus seems something of an anachronism.[420] The connections which exist between the *Liber ad filium* and later Latin works which are readily thought of as didactic, then, reflect the ready interpretation of Cato's text as the foundation point of didactic prose literature in Latin, rather than Cato's awareness of the concept or deliberate decision to begin such a tradition to rival that of the Greeks.[421] While Cato's

[416] Cato's written works all display a desire to offer moral and technical instruction (Astin (1978) 204).
[417] Although Cato's works, particularly the *Liber*, do exhibit similarities to the wider Greco-Roman didactic tradition; the combination of technical advice with gnomic utterance in order to instruct fully, the prominent addressee, literary artistry, and simultaneity, have all been identified as hallmarks of the didactic genre; see Volk (2002) 27-43.
[418] The *Liber* is clearly presented as an alternative to the immoral Greek *litteras* which he condemns in F1.
[419] Cato writes with immediate purpose, rather than with a lengthy perspective of a literary orientation. The claims which Cato makes for his texts are starkly different from the primacy purported by later Latin authors; see Hinds (1998) 52-98.
[420] On the difficulties of defining didactic as a genre, see Volk (2002) 27-43.
[421] On the profound influence of Cato on later prose didactic, see LeMoine (1991); see also below p.206 n.2.

writings are certainly not unsophisticated, exhibiting design and planning, they are overwhelmingly the products of practical experience and have pragmatic purposes, and it is thus difficult to detach them from their immediate context in an effort to classify them for the sake of critical convenience. Nonetheless, Cato's connection of the *Liber ad filium* to Greek technical writings, his clear instructional purposes, and his influence over later Latin works of this type make the term 'didactic' a useful one for this text.

While the *Liber* is probably best seen as something of a loose didactic treatise, the prominence of the address to Licinianus within the work is remarkable. Distinct amongst Cato's didactic works, this address has led to a long series of epistolary interpretations of the work; later authors citing the *Liber ad filium* have identified the text as having an epistolary preface, or as itself a letter, or letter collection; modern editors have often attributed all or a portion of these fragments to a letter, and scholars have often been eager to acknowledge the work's epistolary colour. It is not impossible that Cato himself conceived of the *Liber* as an extended letter or series of letters. Such collections of literary letters were an established genre by this time and epistles attributed to Pythagoras, with whose teachings Cato was familiar, were particularly popular.[422] The *Liber ad filium* could be made to fit the pattern of a series of letters, with its three discrete sections, each on a different theme, its short length, the moral and ethical emphasis of its content, and its didactic nature.[423] We also know that Cato did address Licinianus in several letters.[424] However, there is much in the *Liber* which would be difficult to reconcile with such a form, and the overwhelmingly practical and strongly

[422] On the pseudo-epigraphic collections attributed to Pythagoras during the Hellenistic period, see Thesleff (1965). On the popularity of Pythagoras with the Roman nobility, see Garbarino (1973) 221-58. On Cato's involvement in the discovery and burning of Pythagoras' books in 181, see Gruen (1990) 158-70.
[423] On the tendency for epistolary writers to treat a single theme in a single letter, see Sherwin-White (1966) 3; on the brevity of letters, see Sen. *Ep*. 45.13; Plin. *Ep*. 3.9.27; on the importance of moral advice within letters, see Demetr. *Eloc*. 232; on the didactic nature of most epistolary writing, see Morello and Morrison (2007) viii.
[424] The use of the same addressee as a recipient for different types of literary works is paralleled by Seneca, who addresses the moralising content of both his letters and some of his dialogues to Lucilius.

occasional nature of the text ultimately preclude this interpretation. It is difficult to reconcile a collection of literary letters along with Cato's wider works; the seemingly genuine missives sent to Licinianus on campaign, the practical origins of his treatises, and the pragmatic approaches of his speeches, make such a move into stylised literary letters rather counter to Cato's profile as a writer. Instead, it is likely that this epistolary element to Cato's works arose from the personal addresses made to his son as part of the youth's instruction. The prominence of the addressee in the *Liber* is thus a nod to the work's oral origins and practical nature, rather than a deliberate styling of the text as an epistolary preface, epistle, or collection of epistles.[425] Disconnected from this context in its later editions, it is easy to see how the *Liber ad filium* came to be read and cited as a letter. While the place of the addressee within the *Liber* clearly needs acknowledging, and the epistolary interpretations to which the text has been subject are certainly significant for charting its reception, I don't think that it is possible to read this, otherwise predominantly didactic text, in an epistolary fashion.[426]

As far as it can be defined, then, the form of the *Liber ad filium* appears to have been that of a didactic treatise, strongly connnected to its original context as part of Licinianus' instruction. The *Liber* was one of Cato's many and varied didactic works and, while the Censor's own ideas of genre were likely to be near non-existent, it was to become very influential over a clear tradition of later Latin didactic prose writings.

A date for the work's circulation of around 176-5 has been proposed above, and it has been noted that this period would be a timely point within Cato's political life for the circulation of

[425] Cato's use of an addressee within this work may also reflect the moral and ethical importance of its teachings; a 2nd person singular verb is used to evoke an addressee at a comparable point in the *Origines*, encouraging the reader to reflect upon the different ways in which achievement can be honoured; see F76 *FRHist*. with Cornell (2013) *ad loc.*

[426] It is worth comparing the *Liber* briefly to the epistolary treatises of Cicero; the *ad M. Brutum Orator* also stands between treatise and letter, but in this case Cicero is clearly separated from his addressee (the work was written to Brutus whilst he was a magistrate in Cisalpine Gaul), in a way which Cato and Licinianus are not.

the *Liber ad filium*, falling amidst the string of prosecutions which followed Cato's censorship in 184, and serving to remind his peers of his paternal skills and to recapitulate some of his censorial authority.[427] In addition to this broadly circumstantial evidence, several factors within the text itself suggest that the *Liber ad filium* was prepared with a wider audience than Licinianus in mind. Cato's careful selection from and summary of his wider technical notes suggests a level of intent in the *Liber*'s craft which is not easily compatible with a private collection of teachings. Furthermore, the evidence which the fragments present for the work's structure and points of stylised polish suggest that the *Liber* was not simply for the use of Cato's son, but was repurposed and refashioned from a set a notes, into a work suitable for a wider audience.[428] This is most obvious in the work's opening, which is replete with high rhetoric against the Greek race and which appears to describe the *Liber ad filium* as a rival to their tradition of medical literature.[429] Exactly when, how, and to whom Cato circulated this work it is impossible to speculate. The *Liber ad filium* may have been made known to Cato's, and later Licinianus' household, his wider acquaintances, or to his peers at large. We can be certain, nonetheless, that the work came into circulation in the public domain at a later date - sections of the text were well known in the 1st century BC and it was clearly available by this time. If not circulated by the Censor then it is most likely that the *Liber ad filium* was either put into circulation by a member of Cato's household after his death, or transmitted through the family archives of the Porcii, before being circulated by a later editor. The work's prominence in writers of the 1st century BC raises the possibility that it was re-edited and recirculated by a scholar about this time.[430] It is possible that such an edition included other works of Cato's, most likely the *Epistulae*, but the inclusion of his

[427] See below p.190-1.
[428] Indeed, this intermittent use of literary polish may well be a deliberate stylistic choice in itself: the roughness of the work acting as continued proof of its practical origins, and therefore playing an important part in Cato's self-fashioning as a skilled and seasoned *pater familias*; see below p.198-200.
[429] F1.
[430] See below p.145-6.

other, shorter works is not to be ruled out.[431] The circulation of the *Liber ad filium*, then, is a tempting possibility for which evidence can be found in the text itself, as well as in the lives of Censor and son. The work was certainly circulated in time and the form and manner of these editions and the citations taken from them is, inevitably, but by no means detrimentally, read back into the present reconstruction of the text.

### 2.5.3 *Epistulae*

**F. 22** [36. Popilius imperator tenebat provinciam, in cuius exercitu Catonis filius tiro militabat. Cum autem Popilio videretur unam dimittere legionem, Catonis quoque filium, qui in eadem legione militabat, dimisit. Sed cum amore pugnandi in exercitu remansisset, Cato ad Popilium scripsit, ut, si eum patitur in exercitu remanere, secundo eum obliget militiae sacramento, quia priore amisso iure cum hostibus pugnare non poterat. Adeo summa erat observatio in bello movendo.] 37. Marci quidem Catonis senis est epistula ad Marcum filium, in qua scribit se audisse eum missum factum esse a consule cum in Macedonia bello Persico miles esset. Monet igitur ut caveat ne proelium ineat; negat enim ius esse qui miles non sit cum hoste pugnare.

[36. Popilius was a general in charge of a province. Cato's son was a newly enlisted soldier campaigning in his army. When Popilius decided to disband one of his legions, he also discharged Cato's son, who was on campaign with that legion. But when the youth, out of his love for battle, remained in the field, Cato wrote to Popilius that if he allowed his son to stay in the field, he must swear him into service with another oath of allegiance, since, with his former oath now dissolved, he could not enter battle with the enemy. So careful was his observance of the correct conduct of war.] 37. Indeed, there is a letter written by the old man Marcus Cato to his son Marcus, in which he wrote that he had heard that the youth had been

[431] While not a certainty, this would be the best explanation of the epistolary and encyclopaedic descriptions of the *Liber ad filium* that our sources present.

discharged by the consul when he was serving as a soldier in Macedonia in the war against Perses. He reminded him, therefore, to refrain from entering the fighting; for, he says, that it is not lawful for one who is not a soldier to engage in battle with an enemy.

Cic. *Off*. 1.36-7

*Epistulae* F4 J. = *Epistulae* F6 C. = *ELM* F6

This letter, written by the Censor to his son Licinianus while the youth was engaged in military service abroad, is cited by Cicero as part of his discussion of justice in the first book of the *De officiis*, a work of instruction which he addressed to his own son.[432] Cicero cites Cato's letter to emphasise the importance of the proper rights and due conduct of war, and, in particular, of the Fetial code which stipulated procedures for the declaration of war and commencement of battle. The letter is also mentioned by Plutarch, who cites it within a similar discussion of Roman military practice, specifically as evidence for the presence of soldiers in the field who were not directly involved in fighting.[433]

Cicero's description of Licinianus' circumstances, 'when he was serving as a soldier in Macedonia in the war against Perses' (*cum in Macedonia bello Persico miles esset*),[434] allows us to date the letter addressed to him to the Third Macedonian War. Within the period of the war itself, there are several possible occasions when Licinianus' military oath could have been called upon for renewal; in 169 part of the Roman fleet was disbanded, while the consul Q. Marcius Philippus asked for reinforcements around this time,[435] and in 168 the consul

[432] The first of the two letters mentioned in this passage, addressed by Cato to his son's commander Popilius, is to be disregarded. This section of Cicero's text (36) has long since been identified as a gloss, on both historical and linguistic grounds; Mommsen's initial judgement on this passage has been followed by the majority of editors, including Winterbottom (1994), who brackets this section in the text used here. For a detailed analysis of the passage and the reasons for excluding it from our discussion here, see Cugusi (1970b) 51-4.
[433] Plut. *Mor*. 273e.
[434] Cic. *Off*. 1.37.
[435] Livy 44.16.1-3.

Gaius Licinius levied further reinforcements to send to Macedonia.[436] Either of these instances would have provided an appropriate opportunity for the recently discharged Licinianus to extend his term of service.[437]

Cato's advice to his son on the important juridical topic of the *ius belli* was informed both by his own military experience and his legal knowledge.[438] The guidance given to Licinianus in this letter thus demonstrates Cato training and teaching his son in the ways of his father, and, in particular, instructing him in the rites and rituals of Roman religion. This display clearly promoted Cato as an exemplary *pater familias*, and, if made public with the circulation of the letter, would have contributed to his political prestige.[439] In particular, the guidance of this letter may relate to the aristocratic practice of sending an older male relative or family friend on campaign with a new recruit - the letter offering a textual rendering of the advice and guidance provided by such a figure.[440] The guidance given to Licinianus in this letter would thus represent the final stage of his education at the hands of his father, complementing the instruction given in the *Historia* and the *Liber ad filium*. Indeed, given the legal successes of Licinianus' career, the instruction offered here would have become a point of particular pride for both father and son.

[436] Livy 44.20.5-9
[437] Cugusi (1970b) 54.
[438] On Cato's legal works, see above p.33. In addition to these writings on law, Cato discussed contracts in with great expertise in the *De agricultura* (*Agr*. 144-5) and was known for his skill in the subject (Livy 39.40.6).
[439] The epistolary mode, which offered a privileged glimpse into strategic elements of an individual's private life in the open letter, has long been connected with exemplarity (Mayer (1994) 4-5); in particular, epistles have been associated with their author's display of his successful negotiation of social relations (Gibson (2012)), and with the creation and advertisement by the elite, in particular, of the social standards expected of their class (Morello and Morrison (2007) 302). It is tempting to set Cato's letter to Licinianus within these epistolary conventions: Cato made ready use of his own example and repeatedly sought to assimilate himself to the practices of the elite; the epistle itself can be read very easily on these terms. However, it is difficult to assert that Cato wrote with the intention to circulate the letter, or that he felt himself to be writing in a certain epistolary genre.
[440] On the practice, see Plaut. *Mostell*. 129-30 with discussion below p.170-1.

This letter was composed, at least originally, as a private missive sent from Cato to Licinianus, providing advice at a particular juncture within his career.[441] Whether or not Cato circulated the letter after the events described is impossible to say with certainty; however, several pieces of evidence suggest that he did. Cato's tactical use of letters and letter writing is well attested within his campaigns in Spain, both in his communications with his various allies and with the senate;[442] Cato was even keen to remind his audience of his correspondence in the speech he made on his consulship after his return to Rome.[443] Nor was the Censor the only member of the elite who drew public attention to his military communications;[444] and so there would be clear political advantages for both father and son, particularly as Licinianus endeavoured to launch a public career, to the wider circulation of these letters.[445] Indeed, the Censor's well known tendencies for self-promotion make this a tempting possibility.[446] At any rate, the letter was readily available in the 1st century BC and Cicero certainly knew the text first hand. While he does not cite Cato's words verbatim, the phrase which he uses to evoke the content of the letter, 'for, he says, that it is not lawful for one who is not a soldier to engage in battle with an enemy' (*negat enim ius esse qui miles non sit cum hoste pugnare*), is highly reminiscent of Cato's force, brevity, and wit.[447]

**F. 23** *** mansues ad ***

[441] Indeed, this is the earliest extant private letter written in Latin (Cugusi (1983) 152).
[442] The Censor made use of letters in his effective communication with his allies (*ORF*$^{3}$ 34 = *ELM* F1 = Charisius, *Gramm*. 1 p.222 l.34 K.); in his timely reports to the senate (*ELM* F3 = Livy 34.42.1); and in a clever tactical play made to out-manoeuvre several rebellious Spanish towns during his consulship (*ELM* F2 = Frontin. *Str*. 1.1.1; App. *Hisp*. 41; [Aur. Vict.] *De vir*. *ill*. 47.2; Zonar. 9.17.6).
[443] *ORF*$^{3}$ 34.
[444] See below p.143-5.
[445] A period of successful military service was essential to launch a political career in Rome, especially for one, such as Licinianus, from a non-patrician background (Wiseman (1971) 116-22).
[446] As Cugusi suggests, 'ma ad ammettere per Catone la 'novità' di dar diffusione volta per volta ad alcune sue lettere private, a differenza di quanto era successo in precedenza, mi pare non si debba essere contrari, tanto più se si considera quel prepotente spirito di originalità che contraddistinse il Censore in tanti campi,' ((1970b) 50).
[447] Cic. *Off*. 1.37.

*** tractable to ***

Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* p.140 l.36-7 L.
*Epistulae* F2 J. = *Epistulae* F4 C. = *ELM* F4

This highly fragmentary citation from one of Cato's letters is made by Festus as part of his definition of the unusual form *mansues, -etis*. Festus clearly notes that these words were taken from a letter of Cato's, stating that, 'Cato in a letter...' (*Cato in epistola*).[448] Paulus' epitome of Festus' work tells us that *mansues* is a variant form of the adjective *mansuetus, -a, -um* (*pro mansuetus*), but he gives no further indication as to the content or context of the citation.[449] Several scholars have conjectured that this letter was a private one addressed to Licinianus, although this is not indicated in the text of either Festus or Paulus.[450]

The wider content and context for this missive are difficult to determine. The definition of *mansues, -etis,* as 'tame' or 'domesticated', with regard to animals, and as 'mild', 'malleable', or 'merciful' with regard to people, would be well suited to a military context describing interactions with an enemy; however, this definition could equally suit a domestic context, and would not be out of place in a different setting entirely.[451] This range of topics does not naturally indicate any one clear addressee. It is tempting to assume Licinianus as the recipient of this letter, as the only known individual addressee of Cato's private correspondence; however, this letter is not necessarily a private piece of correspondence, nor is it necessarily the case that Cato wrote letters to no other individual.[452] On the basis of such

[448] Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* p.140 l.36 L.
[449] Paul. Fest. *Gloss. Lat.* p.141 l.10 L.
[450] Lindsay (1930-1) *ad loc.* and Muller (1930) both postulate the idea of an individual letter to Licinianus; Schmidt (1972) has this fragment as part of the one, extended letter which he holds that Cato wrote for his son.
[451] See *TLL* s.v. *mansues, -etis,* 8.0.327.35ff.
[452] The fact that no citations come down to us from a public letter of Cato's, or from a private missive to a different addressee, suggests that all of the citations which we do have were addressed to Licinianus, whether or not they are described as such; however, there can be no absolute certainty of this.

circumstantial evidence as the existence of other epistles, written by Cato on military topics to his son whilst serving abroad, it is reasonable to propose a similar content and context for this letter, thus dating the work to around 171-68. If, indeed, Cato circulated his correspondence with Licinianus whilst the youth was on campaign, it is probable that this text, too, would have been circulated as part of that sequence of letters. We do know that the letter was widely available during the 1st century BC and was cited verbatim by the Augustan grammarian, Verrius Flaccus, then followed by Festus. However they may have originally come into the public domain, it is clear, then, that a number of Cato's letters were well known to the scholars of the 1st century BC.

**F. 24** quia saepe utiles videntur praedonuli

Since often those little brigands seem useful

Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* p.280. l.23-4 L.
*Epistulae* F1 J. = *Epistulae* F5 C. = *ELM* F5

Festus cites these words as part of his definition of the unusual form *praedonulus, -i*, which he notes Cato uses as a diminutive (ὑποκοριστικῶς). Festus clearly states that these words were taken from one of Cato's letters (*in epistularum*).[453] Paulus' epitome gives the additional information that *praedonulus, -i* is a diminutive for *praedo, -onis*, stating that 'it is a diminutive, the same Cato uses this instead of brigands', (*id est deminutive, idem Cato*

[453] Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* p.280. l.23 L. Festus' description strongly suggests that he, or his source, knew a collection of Cato's letters; this scenario makes good sense of Festus' otherwise ungrammatical *in epistularum* (in + genitive), by allowing us to read *in libro epistularum*. On the possibility of these letters appearing in a collected edition, see below p.145-6.

*posuit pro praedonibus*).[454] It has been conjectured that the letter from which these words were taken was also addressed to Licinianus, although there is no direct evidence for this.[455]

The citation certainly appears to have come from a military context, and it may have been part of a description of Cato's campaigns in Spain, which brought him into contact with robbers and brigands.[456] The use of the diminutive form, *praedonulus, -i*, strongly suggests a private letter addressed to a recipient with whom Cato was on familiar terms. The tone of the diminutive has been identified as 'ironic',[457] and the unusual form may have been part of the language typical of soldiers.[458] The content of the letter is thus suggestive of another epistle addressed to Licinianus whilst the youth served under Aemilius Paullus; the nature of the advice offered, in an informal tone, and in language familiar to someone else in the forces, all lend support to this suggestion. The letter could thus be dated with relative certainty to around 171–68. As with the previous fragment, if Cato put into circulation any of his correspondence with his son, this text would certainly be amongst those letters. These missives may not have been circulated by the Censor, but they were certainly available in the public domain during the 1st century BC, and our citation here, though not at first hand, represents a verbatim quotation of the text.

**F. 25** Interempto praestari

to be presented to one deceased

[454] Paul. Fest. *Gloss. Lat.* p.281 l.9-10 L. In fact, the proper diminutive, by analogy with *latro* - *latrunculus*, would be **praedunculus, -i*.
[455] Schmidt (1972).
[456] Livy 34.21.1-6.
[457] Till (1935) 78.
[458] Hanssen (1951) 130-1.

Diom. 1. p.366. l.9ff K.

*Epistulae* F5 J. = *Epistulae* F9 C. = *ELM* F9

Diomedes cites these words of Cato, alongside mentioning Sallust and Seneca the Younger, as examples of authors making use of the rare form *praesto, -stiti*, with the same meaning as the more common *praebeo, -ii* (*in dandi significatione 'praebeo' potius dicebant*).[459] Diomedes attributes the citation to a work Cato *ad Magnum*, which seems likely to have been a letter, indicated by the familiar *ad* + addressee formula which became the standard designation for letters and letter collections.[460] Jordan's conjecture of *ad M. filium*, for *ad Magnum*, has been widely accepted and, overall, the suggestion that this citation was made from a letter which Cato addressed to Licinianus is by far the most sensible interpretation of the passage. The content of the letter, again, has the appearance of being concerned with military matters, which would plausibly make this fragment a citation from one of the letters which the Censor addressed to his son whilst he was on campaign. The letter could then be dated, as with those above, to the period 171–168. As with Fs 22-4, this letter may well have been circulated by Cato with the rest of his correspondence with Licinianus. Although we cannot be certain when the text came to public knowledge, it is cited – though likely indirectly through an intermediary source - verbatim by Diomedes here.

**F. 26** *ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ* Παῦλος *ὁ στρατηγὸς ἠγάσθη τὸ μειράκιον, καὶ* Κάτωνος *αὐτοῦ φέρεταί τις ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὸν υἱόν ὑπερφυῶς ἐπαινοῦντος τὴν περὶ τὸ ξίφος φιλοτιμίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ σπουδήν.*

[459] Diom. 1. p.366. l.9ff K.
[460] See above p.122-4.

On account of this feat Paullus, his commander, admired the youth, and there exists a letter written to his son by Cato himself, commending heartily his love of honour and his effort with regard to his sword.

Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.11

*Epistulae* F3 J. = *Epistulae* F7 C. = *ELM* = F7

Plutarch narrates briefly the education and career of Cato's eldest son, Licinianus, as part of the central section of his biography, which deals with Cato's family life. As part of this section, Plutarch recalls Licinianus' excellence as a soldier, in spite of his physical deficiencies, and, in particular, he narrates an incident from the battle of Pydna, where Licinianus was serving under the command of Aemilius Paullus, as proof of this. During the battle, we are told, Licinianus daringly rescued his sword, lost out of his sweaty grip in earlier fighting, from amidst the thick of the enemy. This feat won Licinianus the admiration of his commander (and his future father-in-law), as well as a congratulatory letter from his father. The incident itself is treated by several writers, but only Plutarch makes mention of Cato's letter.[461] Plutarch's setting of this incident at Pydna means that we can date the composition of the letter to around 168. While some editors have seen this fragment as coming from the same letter as F22, the only other epistolary fragment which can be ascribed to Licinianus with certainty, the different circumstances and content of each of these fragments strongly suggests that they came from separate missives.[462] It would surely be most natural for Cato to correspond with his son on a number of occasions during his first lengthy absence from home.

[461] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.10-1, *Aem*. 21; Just. *Epit*. 33.2; Frontin. *Str*. 4.5.17; Val. Max. 3.2.16.
[462] See bibliography given in Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001) *ad loc.*

Cato's letter was full of praise for Licinianus' achievement, 'commending heartily his love of honour and his effort with regard to his sword' (*ὑπερφυῶς ἐπαινοῦντος τὴν περὶ τὸ ξίφος φιλοτιμίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ σπουδήν*).[463] Such congratulatory epistles were a common category of letters, and while it is unlikely that Cato saw himself as writing something of an established type, Plutarch may well have read Cato's text as part of this broader tradition.[464] It may be in comparison with other similar letters that Plutarch deemed Cato's own laudation of his son as rather extravagant (*ὑπερφυῶς*),[465] a judgement which he has previously levelled at Cato's representation of his own achievements.[466] While Plutarch deemed Cato's depictions of his own and his son's achievements as rather overblown, he nonetheless approved Licinianus' noble actions. In fact, for Plutarch these actions are testament to the quality of the youth's upbringing and instruction at the hands of his father: 'being a youth brought up under the finest instruction and owing a great father a great display of his virtue, he did not think life to be worth living if he let fall to the enemy spoils from his still living body' (*οἷα δὲ νεανίας ἐντεθραμμένος καλλίστοις παιδεύμασι, καὶ μεγάλῳ πατρὶ μεγάλης ἀρετῆς ἀποδείξεις ὀφείλων, οὐ βιωτὸν ἡγησάμενος εἶναι προεμένῳ σκῦλον αὐτοῦ ζῶντος τοῖς πολεμίοις*).[467] Licinianus' recovery of his sword was of strategic significance within Plutarch's view of the Censor: it is a moment which demonstrates and culminates Cato's successful education of his

[463] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.11.
[464] Congratulatory letters form the first category in a long list of types of epistles given by Julius Victor (*Rhet. Lat. Min.* p.448 l.19 Halm); congratulations are given as the primary topic for epistolary writing by Demetrius (*Eloc*. 232); and they are the sixteenth of forty one categories of letters listed by pseudo-Libanius (*Epistolary Styles* 4). The established popularity of this type of letter raises the possibility that it might be a product of Plutarch's imagination. It was typical for Latin biographers to insert such documents into their accounts, thereby increasing their own historical credibility; see Cugusi (1983) 142. Moreover, the Second Sophistic displayed a distinct interest in fictional letters, as the works of the likes of Alciphron demonstrate (Trapp (2003) 32). However, there is also a convincing case for Cato's composition and circulation of such a document in the political context of the 2nd century BC, as well as a relative confidence in Plutarch's sources for this section of his biography. On balance I am happy to accept this letter as genuine, but the existence of such falsified documents is nevertheless important background here.
[465] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.11.
[466] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 14.2; cf. Livy 34.15.9.
[467] Plut. *Aem*. 21.2.

son, something which Plutarch keenly admired.[468] This congratulatory letter would most likely be the final item of correspondence which Cato addressed to his son on campaign, building upon the advice offered in his previous letters, the culmination of the training received at his hands.[469]

As with the other epistolary fragments discussed, it is not possible to state with any certainty whether or not this letter was circulated beyond Cato's immediate family. However, there are a variety of circumstances which suggest that this may have been the case. First of all, the congratulatory content of the missive makes it difficult to imagine as a strictly private piece of correspondence; the letter does not address a particular need or circumstance, but adopts a general line of praise, such as is normally awarded in public.[470] Secondly, such public circulation of private correspondence has much in common with contemporary elite practices and is thus of clear political value to both Cato and Licinianus. The use of their public correspondence with the senate by Roman magistrates in the field in order to boast about their personal successes on campaign was well-established by Cato's day.[471] The 2nd century BC saw this hijacking of official correspondence escalate, and we find several of Cato's contemporaries circulating their diplomatic correspondence amongst their elite peers in order to promote their own achievements.[472] One such letter was written by the elder Scipio

[468] Plutarch's interests in education are well documented. The biographer's desire to represent each of his subjects as teachers comes to fruition here in the case of Cato; indeed, his successful education of his son is one of the most positive aspects of Plutarch's presentation of the Censor; see Sansone (1989) 12-4.
[469] This depends upon the exact date for Licinianus' renewal of his term of military service; evidence suggests – though it is by no means conclusive - that this was before 168, and that Pydna was the youth's final campaign; see above p.134-5.
[470] The recognition of military achievement was an habitual part of aristocratic life; it typically took place publically, in such contexts as the *gratulatio*, the *triumphus*, in the *tituli* and *imagines*, and ultimately in the *laudatio funebris*.
[471] Plautus parodies the inflated descriptions of military action found within these reports, exagerrating them into comic versions of the messenger speech of Greek Tragedy (Plaut. *Amph*. 186-96, 203-47, 250-61 with Oniga (1998)). It is likely that Cato himself wrote similarly boastful reports from his campaigns as consul in Spain. He certainly made the most of his opportunity, as military tribune, to report Glabrio's successes against Antiochus to the senate, giving a version of events which focussed on his own personal achievements (Livy 36.21.4 with Dillery (2009) 97-8).
[472] On the autobiographical potential of such documents, see Lewis (1991, 1993).

Africanus to Philip of Macedon;[473] aiming to earn his friendship with Rome, Scipio demonstrated the strength of the Romans' position by recounting his own successes against the Carthaginians in Spain, and in particular, the capture of New Carthage.[474] A similar letter was also written by Africanus to Prusias, the king of Bithynia, in which he recounted the respect and reverence with which Rome treated her allied kings, convincing Prusias to continue the alliance with examples from his own household (*domesticis ipse exemplis Prusiam ad promerendam amicitiam suam compulit*).[475] A similar letter was written by his son-in-law, Scipio Nasica, on his own successes in the campaign leading up to the battle of Pydna.[476] The letter, addressed to an unknown king, narrated the course of the campaign and gave particular prominence to the young Nasica's exploits. The letter seems to have gone into some detail and was an important source for Plutarch's *Life of Aemilius Paullus*.[477] Neither Polybius nor Livy mention the letter, which suggests that it was private correspondence and, most likely, was circulated within select groups, rather than sent as part of a genuine diplomatic enterprise and preserved in the public archives. Further to this, a similar letter was written by Scipio Aemilianus on his role in the capture of Numantia;[478] and both Lucilius and Mummius wrote letters full of praise for their own military achievements in verse.[479] In the context of this strategic circulation of military correspondence it is probable that Cato also made his congratulatory letter to Licinianus available to his elite peers. In particular, comparison and competition with Nasica's account of his achievements at Pydna seems inevitable.[480] It is difficult to imagine such a skilled politician and prolific writer as Cato

[473] Polyb. 10.9.3.
[474] On which, see Polyb. 10.6.7-8; Livy 26.42-7.
[475] Livy 37.25.8ff.
[476] Plut. *Aem*. 15.5.
[477] Plut. *Aem*. 15.5, 16.3, 18.5, 21.7; see also Cugusi (1970b) 23-9.
[478] Fronto, *Ep*. p.120 l.21ff VdH.
[479] Lucilius = Lucil. 181ff; Mummius = Cic. *Att*. 13.6.4.
[480] Cato's letter to Licinianus offered a remarkable contrast to that of Nasica; choosing to set his son's achievement in the Latin language and in the familial context which was traditional for the articulation of praise in Roman culture, rather than writing in Greek and seeking to impress foreign powers with his individual prowess.

passing up the opportunity to engage in this competition. Thirdly, the careful circulation of this letter would also find a parallel, in due course, with the *Origines*, which recorded these events and may even have mentioned this letter.[481]

We can be certain, then, that this congratulatory letter came to be widely known, even if its text was not put into circulation by Cato himself. If, in fact, the letters written for Licinianus were not circulated by the censor, then there are two plausible routes by which they might have come into the public domain. The first is that they were collected and put into circulation by a member of Cato's household after his death.[482] The second is that they were kept privately in the family archives of the Porcii and were then edited as a collection some time in the 1st century BC.[483] These are, of course, not the only possible means by which the letters were made public, but they are the most plausible.[484] Our sources suggest that they knew a collection of Cato's letters; Diomedes, for example, describes his citation from Cato in this way at F24, and Plutarch introduces his description of Cato's congratulatory epistle as *ἐν ἐπιστολῇ τινι* at F26. Given the the absence of any non-filial fragments from Cato's letters it is tempting to think that this collection focussed upon Cato's correspondence with Licinianus. There is some evidence to suggest that such a volume also contained the *Liber ad filium*; as has been noted above, a combined edition of these texts may help to explain the

[481] On Cato's repeated references to his written works, see above p.24-5.
[482] An early date for the circulation of these letters would allow us to see their influence over later 2nd century BC epistolary productions, such as the letters of Cornelia to her son Gaius Gracchus, which seem to follow the general bent of Cato's paternal advice to a son entering the world of Roman politics. On the fragments (and their questionable authenticity), see Cugusi (1970a) 110-3.
[483] The verse letters of Mummius were passed down in this manner (Cic. *Att.* 13.6.4).
[484] It is possible that some of the *Epistulae* were preserved publically in official archives, although this would depend on the public, as opposed to private nature of the documents. Military correspondence was regularly retained in this manner (e.g. Cugusi (1992-2002) nos. 156-7; Fink (1971) 335-6, 411, 417). These fragments may also have been preserved by the annalists, who were notorious for elaborating their histories by inserting various letters and documents, many of dubious authenticity (for a treatment of several of the letters featured in the annalists, and their authenticity, see Cugusi (1970b) 100-7). However, this seems unlikely: such personal documents do not fit well into the narrative patterns of annalistic history - the letters have little to offer a history of Rome's public affairs. The extant fragments from the annalistic tradition of the 2nd and early 1st centuries BC suggest that it was not kind to Cato, and it is difficult to see why his private letters would feature within it (Della Corte (1969) 162-71).

strongly epistolary designation of *ad filium* given to the *Liber* so frequently. Furthermore, both Cicero and Plutarch cite from the *Liber* and *Epistulae* in close proximity;[485] Cicero prominently evoking the *Liber* in the *De officiis*, alongside citations from the *Epistulae* within that work.[486] The fact that Cicero invokes both the *Liber* and one of the *Epistulae* in this same work makes it tempting to think that he saw both texts as epistles and that he had access to them in a single volume. It is difficult to ascertain when such a collection was produced or by whom; the evidence from Cicero suggests that a collection of Cato's works which focussed upon his son might have existed already in his day. Indeed, such a specialised collection would fall well within the research interests of Cicero's intellectual circle. Besides Cicero himself, Nepos, Atticus, and Varro, all wrote on the Censor in a variety of scholarly works.[487] The re-editing of the works which Cato addressed to his son, after their first haphazard circulation by the Censor himself, by scholars of the 1st century BC offers, I believe, the most rational explanation for the state of the evidence as we have it.

The epistolary fragments discussed here certainly came to be widely known. Sharing their immediate didactic aims with the *Liber ad filium*, the works may well also have been edited together by later scholars. That the works also shared a wider political purpose and were circulated by the Censor is a tempting, but ultimately unprovable possibility.

[485] Cic. *Off.* 1.1, 1.36-7; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20, 23.
[486] F22 = Cic. *Off.* 1.36-7. On the relationship between the two works more generally, see below p.221-6.
[487] Nepos, at Atticus' suggestion, composed an extensive *Vita Catonis*; Cato would have featured in Atticus' *Liber Annalis*; Varro appears to have featured Cato in his *De imaginibus* and in his *Logistorici*; Cicero laments the lack of attention paid to Cato and notes the efforts that he went to to build up his own collection of 150 of the Censor's speeches (*Brut.* 65-6). For further detail on Cicero's interest in Cato, see below p.207-33. For the importance of this period in the preservation of republican Latin literature, see Reynolds and Wilson (1991) 18-24.

## 3 Marcus Porcius Cato: Teacher, Father, and Censor

The works which Cato addressed to his son Licinianus provide a fresh perspective on his life and times. This section explores the evidence offered by these texts, alongside that provided by historical accounts and biographical material, for the Censor's cultural and political interests, setting these against a broader picture of the 2nd century BC. The *Historia*, *Liber ad filium*, and the *Epistulae*, though practical in origin, appear, as with much of Cato's writing, to have had polish and purpose beyond their immediate instructional aims, making them particularly important for our understanding of the Censor.[1] Even in their fragmentary state, these texts offer evidence for some of the most important issues of Cato's lifetime – the changing nature of Rome's nobility, their culture, relationships, and emerging role as rulers of the Mediterranean. Specifically, these texts illuminate something of the changing emphases of Roman education, their contestations, and the central place which Cato held within these debates. They also point to the importance of popular support for political success during this period, their strongly paternal aspect apparently forming an important part of Cato's public image which, as evidence from Roman Comedy suggests, appealed to the Roman *populus*. Furthermore, with their careful reconstruction of traditional ideas and imagery, these works highlight some of the struggles which Cato underwent as a political newcomer aiming at high office and are suggestive of some of the rhetoric of the *novus homo* developed by Cicero and his peers during the 1st century BC. The evidence provided by these texts is thus of no small value to scholars. The discussion here is structured under three headings, considering Cato as a teacher, father, and Censor. These distinct sections look at the role which the works that Cato addressed to Licinianus played within each of these

[1] On the possible circulation of these works, see above p.20-8; on the strategic nature of the *Liber ad filium* in particular, see, for example, Kienast (1954) 105; Gruen (1992) 77-80; Vogt-Spira (2000) 113; Bloomer (2011) 154-5.

particular apects of his career and, more broadly, within the culture and politics of the 2nd century BC. It is hoped that this will demonstrate the value of the evidence found in these fascinating texts.

## 3.1 Teacher

The works which Cato addressed to Licinianus all exhibit a connection to the boy's education. It has been suggested above that these texts - the *Historia*, *Liber ad filium*, and the *Epistulae* - were all practical in origin and were used directly by the Censor in the instruction of his son. In this section I explore the educational nature of these texts further, considering this against the broader backdrop of the changes and challenges posed to Rome's educational system during the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC. This period saw a growing number of Greek professionals taking up residence in the city and an increasing influence for Hellenistic educational curricula. These developments produced a range of Roman reactions: careful reconstruction and reimagining of their own educational patterns in the past, close-fought competition in the race to incorporate novel Greek practices, and careful debate over the negotiation of the relationships which these practices represented. Cato played no small part in these developments; indeed, education emerges as one of the central concerns of his career - he often spoke on the subject and he regularly intervened in educational matters. The didactic texts which he wrote for his son formed an important element in these educational concerns and the evidence which they offer for this aspect of Cato's career cannot be underestimated.

## Roman Education in the 2nd Century BC

The 3rd century and, increasingly, the 2nd centuries BC saw a transformation of Roman education; the contents of the curriculum, its teachers, and the circumstances of its delivery, all underwent significant shifts during this time.[2] This period saw the establishment of the first fee-paying school in the city. Sp. Carvilius, the freedman of one Spurius Carvilius Maximus Ruga, consul in 234, is recorded as opening Rome's first school, probably between 250 and 225.[3] The opening of this school is unlikely to have been an isolated incident;[4] it must have been one of several similar institutions, the result of growing demand for a literate education. Notably the new educational institutions had consular support: sanction from the highest level of Roman authority. This period also saw an increase in the number of professional teachers like Carvilius. These teachers were Greeks, often from Magna Graecia, and were part of the steady influx of Hellenes into the city; they made use of their skills as bilinguals to feed Rome's growing enthusiasm for Greek literature and culture; 'the earliest learned men, who were also both poets and half-Greeks - I speak of Livius and Ennius, who are recorded as having taught, both publicly and privately, in Latin and Greek – simply translated Greek works, or if they had composed anything actually in Latin, they would read

[2] These changes should be seen as part of the wider cultural change which Rome underwent during this period of military expansion into and increased cultural contact with the Hellenistic world. For a general discussion of cultural interaction during this period, see Gruen (1990), (1992). More recent scholarship has rightly placed emphasis upon Rome's longstanding cultural contacts with Greece (Feeney (2005)), has problematised the notions both of 'Hellenisation' and 'Romanisation' frequently found in discussions of this period (Wallace-Hadrill (2008)), and has sought to deconstruct the traditional opposition found in studies of the ancient Mediterranean between the 'Roman West' and 'Hellenistic East' (Prag and Quinn (2013)); however, the late 3rd and 2nd centuries BC remain a period of markedly increased intensity within the cultural interactions between Rome and the rest of the Mediterranean. For an overview of the influence of Greek educational practice over several centuries of Roman history, see Marrou (1956) 242-54.

[3] Plut. *Mor*. 278e; an anecdote which Harris takes as genuine ((1989) 158). Several passages from Livy suggest that there may have been schools at Rome during the 5th century BC (Livy 3.44.6, 5.27.1-4, 6.25.9); however, the historicity of these passages is very difficult to assess.

[4] The plays of Plautus make several references to schools; *Asin*. 226-8; *Bacch*. 129, 422-48; *Curc*. 258; *Merc*. 292, 303-4; *Persa* 172-4; *Truculentus* 744ff; although these references may have been simply translated from Plautus' originals, they were clearly relevant to his Roman audience, and, in the case of the *Bacchides* the pun between the name of the paedagogus, *Lydus* and the Latin for school, *ludus*, strongly suggests Plautine invention at this point (*Bacch*. 129 with Barsby (1986) *ad loc*.). Cato also mentions petty thieving within a school context in one of his speeches, the *In Pansam* (*ORF*[3] 205). Furthermore, Cato's slave Chilon might have been involved in a similar educational institution; this is the eminently plausible reading of Harris ((1989) 160) and Bloomer ((2011) 28) based on Plut. *Cat*. *Mai*. 20.5. All our evidence suggests that schools were an increasingly popular phenomenon in the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC.

it aloud' (*antiquissimi doctorum, qui idem et poetae et semigraeci erant, - Livium et Ennium dico, quos utraque lingua domi forisque docuisse adnotatum est - nihil amplius quam Graecos interpretabantur, aut si quid ipsi Latine composuissent praelegebant*).[5] Livius Andronicus is attested as having worked as a tutor to the sons of Livius Salinator;[6] and as having produced the *Odusia* as a school text.[7] After a series of military successes in the East in the early 2nd century BC, the number of educated Greek professionals brought to Rome grew significantly; many of these men took on tutorial work within Roman schools and households.[8] Plutarch records that a crowd of teachers and tutors followed Paullus as part of his triumphal procession after his victory over Perses in the Third Macedonian War (*διδασκάλων καὶ παιδαγωγῶν… ὄχλος*).[9] Polybius also makes reference to the abundance of cultured Greeks available for tutoring roles during the 160s; he states that the young Scipio Aemilianus will have no problem in finding a tutor for whichever subject is of interest to him as 'so great is the crowd of such men that I see flocking here from Greece at present' (*πολὺ γὰρ δή τι φῦλον ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπιρρέον ὁρῶ κατὰ τὸ παρὸν τῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων*).[10] This period also saw a shift in the range of subjects taught, as well as in the circumstances of their delivery, and in the tutors available to teach them. An educational curriculum, remarkable in its uniformity and consistency, was an important part of the legacy created by Alexander's successors after his death. This system, known as the *enkyklios paideia*, was designed to create a sense of shared Greek identity across the Mediterranean through a cultural and linguistic *koine* in which all adult males of a certain status would share.[11] The

[5] Suet. *Gram*. 1.2.
[6] Jer. *Chron*. p.148 l.1-2.
[7] The poem was still used in this capacity in the 1st century BC; see Hor. *Epist*. 2.1.71-3.
[8] In addition to those Greeks who took up permanent residence in the city and took on regular tutorial work, a series of visiting philosophers and rhetoricians also gave public lectures, which contributed to Rome's developing educational climate. Rome hosted Crates of Mallos in the early 160s; Diogenes the Babylonian, Carneades of Cyrene, Critolaos of Phaselis in 155; and Panaetius of Lindus from the mid 140s.
[9] Plut. *Aem*. 33.6.
[10] Polyb. 31.24.7. All translations of Polybius are taken from Paton (2010-2).
[11] The level of this cultural and linguistic literacy varied greatly; see Morgan (1998) 4; 74-89.

curriculum was based around the reading of canonical Greek literary texts;[12] although there was some flexibility within its content and structure, the 'cultural elements and objectives' of the *enkyklios paideia* were remarkably uniform.[13] This system of education became widespread and well-instituted across the Hellenistic world during the 3rd century BC.[14] As Rome's contacts with the Hellenistic world increased during this period, the *enkyklios paideia*, as well as the tutors who taught it, and the schools in which they practised, acted as a catalyst for the development of the city's educational system. The remarkable uniformity of the curriculum was continued by the Romans, who 'adopted, adapted and promoted the pattern of education developed in the Hellenistic kingdoms with very few changes in either its content or form'.[15] Evidence from this period confirms the influence of the *enkyklios paideia* over Rome's developing educational system during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC. The *enkyklios paideia* began by teaching the alphabet, before moving on to reading syllables, words, and then whole phrases. This systematic approach to literacy could have been what induced Carvilius, our first recorded school-master, to introduce an important orthographic reform, creating different written signs within the Latin alphabet for the voiced and unvoiced velar consonant, [g] and [k] respectively, for the first time.[16] Similarly, the curriculum placed importance, first of all, upon the reading of great works of Greek literature; this emphasis is likely to have encouraged Livius Andronicus to produce his *Odusia*, an artful Latin translation of Homer's *Odyssey* and an excellent resource for a more advanced student.[17] The late 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC were a crucial period for Roman education; increasing cultural contacts with the Hellenistic world influenced the development of a distinct

[12] For an overview of the curriculum and its contents, see Morgan (1998) 32-9; on the role of literary texts, see Morgan (1998) 90-119.
[13] Cribiore (2001) 4.
[14] Jefferson (2012) 316-7.
[15] Morgan (1998) 24.
[16] Plut. *Mor*. 277d.
[17] On the work's artistry and skill, see Mariotti (1952).

educational system based around Greek professionals, public schools, and a specialised literary curriculum designed to verse its disciples in Hellenic culture.

The impact which this system made upon existing educational structures at Rome is difficult to assess with certainty; however, several pieces of evidence suggest that these developments enjoyed a popular following, quickly establishing themselves alongside, and at times even superseding, traditional practices.

In a rare piece of educational legislation the senate voted to expel Greek philosophers and rhetoricians from Rome in the year 161. The motion was proposed by one M. Pomponius and was authorised by the senate.[18] The legislation attests to the conspicuous number of rhetoricians and philosophers practising in the city in the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War. Such a decree would have been almost impossible to enforce; we must assume that it sought to condemn publicly these practitioners, restricting their popularity and influence, rather than to dismiss their presence from the city. Fascination with philosophy grew over the following decade. In 155 an embassy of Athenian philosophers - Carneades of the New Academy, Diogenes of the Stoa, Critolaus the Peripatetic - the heads of their respective schools, gave public lectures in the city to huge success.[19] In particular, their teachings were very popular with the young; educated Romans flocked to hear the philosophers: 'indeed, those fondest of learning amongst the youth immediately hastened to wait upon these men, listening to them avidly and admiringly' (*εὐθὺς οὖν οἱ φιλολογώτατοι τῶν νεανίσκων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἵεντο καὶ συνῆσαν, ἀκροώμενοι καὶ θαυμάζοντες αὐτούς*); soon their fame spread throughout Rome's younger generation and it was widely reported that Carneades had 'set in the youth a terrible passion, under the influence of which they abandoned their other

[18] Suetonius records the wording of the *senatus consultum*; *Gram.* 25.1. On the incident, see Garbarino (1973) 370-2.
[19] For the historical background to the embassy and its appeal, see Paus. 7.11.4-8.

pleasures and pursuits and were 'possessed' about philosophy' (*ἔρωτα δεινὸν ἐμβέβληκε τοῖς νέοις, ὑφ' οὗ τῶν ἄλλων ἡδονῶν καὶ διατριβῶν ἐκπεσόντες ἐνθουσιῶσι περὶ φιλοσοφίαν*).[20] In the following year, a *senatus consultum* expelled two Epicurean philosophers, Alcaeus and Philiscus from the city;[21] this measure, similar to that of 161, testifies to the growing presence and popularity of an increasing variety of different philosophers within the city.[22] These incidents offer significant evidence for the growing number and increasing repute of practising philosophers and rhetoricians in Rome during the 160s and 150s. Our sources stress the popularity of these professionals with the younger generation and, in particular, emphasise the educational import of their activities. This strongly suggests that the Hellenistic educational system, in the latter stages of which philosophy played a significant part, was becoming increasingly important within Rome's evolving educational structures.

Another incident from 92 testifies to the growing popularity of a rhetorical education. In this year the Censors L. Licinius Crassus and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus issued a decree publicly condemning schools of Latin rhetoric on moral grounds.[23] It has been convincingly argued that this decree aimed to express disapproval of the poor versions of traditional Greek rhetorical training which these schools offered.[24] This demonstrates not only a general acceptance of the 'Hellenic character of Roman higher education', but also the growing demand for this higher education to be made available to as wide an audience as possible.[25] The decree thus offers us further evidence for the popularity and popular impact of the Hellenistic educational system at Rome.

[20] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 22.2-3. On the embassy and its reception, see also Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 22; Plin. *HN* 7.112 (on Cato the Censor); Gell. *NA* 17.21.48, 6.14.9 (on Gaius Acilius); Quint. *Inst*. 12.1.35 (on Carneades' speeches); Cic. *De or*. 2.155; *Rep*. 3.8-12; *Tusc*. 4.5; *Att*. 12.23.2 (on the embassy in general).
[21] Ath. 12.547a; Ael. *VH* 9.12; *Suda* s.v. *Ἐπίκουρος*.
[22] On the date of the decree, see Garbarino (1973) 374-77.
[23] The decree is quoted at Suet. *Gram.* 25.1.
[24] Gruen (1990) 187-91.
[25] Gruen (1990) 190.

From the 3rd century BC onwards Hellenistic educational practices – curricula, institutions, and teachers – began to have an increasing impact upon Roman education; the city's cultural contacts with and military conquests in the Hellenistic world ushered in a period of great change within this area.[26] Some scholars have even dubbed this period as 'a refounding of education at Rome'.[27] The works which Cato addressed to Licinianus are profoundly engaged with these developments. However, these changes were played out against a back-drop of resistance and of a refashioning of traditional Roman education, which will be explored in the following section.

**Traditional Constructions**

Alongside the 'Hellenization of Roman education' which undoubtedly took place during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC we find stories of significant resistance to these changes;[28] the legislation for the expulsion of philosophers and rhetoricians from the city of 161 and 154 discussed above is a good example of this. We also find attempts to articulate a distinctive vision of traditional Roman education, separate from and superior to the Hellenistic educational system. This vision involved a reconstruction of how the *maiores* had educated the young in the past and how the present ought best to preserve that system. As with much of the reconstruction of Roman history which took place during the 2nd century BC, it is difficult to determine how much of this vision genuinely reflected the republican past, and

[26] It must be observed that Roman education prior to this period was constructed in dialogue with Hellenic cultural influences, it is, after all, the Greek alphabet, which was taught to Roman children; our earliest abecedaria show a Greek alphabetic system, with evidence for Etruscan mediation; see Wallace (2011) 9-28. However, the intensified cultural interactions between Rome and the Hellenistic kingdoms, particularly during the period of their development and dispersal of the *enkyklios paideia*, is a rather different phenomenon.
[27] Bloomer (2011) 22.
[28] Gruen (1990) 174.

how much of it reflected the present desire to create a cultural heritage for Rome which diametrically opposed the current encroaching Hellenistic culture.[29] Nevertheless, the Romans' ideas of their own past, and in particular, of their educational system, are essential for our understanding of this period in general, and of Cato the Censor's writings in particular; the works which Cato addressed to his son were significantly engaged in these narratives of resistance and reconstruction.

This vision of Rome's native educational system was strongly based around two elements: the central role of the *pater familias* as the giver of instruction and the practical content and pragmatic delivery of that instruction.[30] In their basic form these two elements are likely to reflect historical reality.[31] Livy's 1st century BC account of the early Republic includes several prominent examples of this kind of paternal instruction.[32] While the value of his account as an accurate reflection of historical fact is limited, these stories have much to tell us about popular memory, and it is difficult to sustain that such a widely held and well established belief in paternal instruction had no historical basis. The most interesting example which Livy furnishes is that of Manlius Imperiosus. Manlius was charged and stood trial for failing to provide his son with an education appropriate to a boy's rank and status; apparently ashamed of the boy's speech defect, Manlius had his son sent to the countryside to engage in agricultural work alongside the slaves on his estate.[33] This deprived him not only of formal

[29] On the probable invention of the annalistic tradition itself, for example, see Gildenhard (2003); on the invention of tradition as a more general phenomenon, see Hobsbawm and Ranger (1992).
[30] Indeed, later authors held that these central elements of Roman education were at the height during the 2nd century BC (Pliny *Ep*. 8.14.4-6 with Sherwin-White (1966) *ad loc*.).
[31] Plutarch is able to attribute the origins of the responsibility of individual Roman fathers for the content and direction of their children's education to Numa (Plut. *Comp*. *Lyc*. *et Num*. 4.2-3); classical scholars generally take this situation as a given for republican Rome, see, for example, Marrou (1956) 229-41; LeMoine (1991) 337.
[32] Livy 5.18.5, 7.4-5; see also Val. Max. 2.7.6.
[33] Only the censors had the authority to intervene in the case that a *pater familias* should fail in his duties to provide an appropriate education for the children of his household (Dion. Hal. *Ant*. *Rom*. 20.13.3). For a recent

tuition, but also of the company of his peers, and the educational opportunities of life lived in a family and about the forum. Livy describes the charges brought against Manlius:[34]

criminique ei tribunus inter cetera dabat quod filium iuuenem nullius probri compertum, extorrem urbe, domo, penatibus, foro, luce, congressu aequalium prohibitum, in opus seruile, prope in carcerem atque in ergastulum dederit, ubi summo loco natus dictatorius iuuenis cotidiana miseria disceret uere imperioso patre se natum esse.

Amongst the other charges, the tribune put forward for the prosecution the fact that, when the youth had been found guilty of no fault, he [Manlius] set his son to work slavishly, in a workhouse that was almost a prison, banishing him from the city, from his home and household gods, from the forum, from daylight, excluding him from the companionship of his peers. In this place the young man, born to the highest rank, son of a dictator, might learn from his daily hardships that he was born to a truly imperious father.

Although Manlius' actions deprived his son of an appropriate education, it is notable that, as his father, Manlius inevitably remains central for his son's instruction. In the absence of proper tuition, the young Manlius is to learn (*disceret*) only the harsh disposition of his father (*vere imperioso patre*), which he deduces from his own wretched condition (*cotidiana miseria*). The younger Manlius then goes on to reproduce the traits which his father taught him perfectly; later in life the *severitas* which caused his father to treat him so cruelly, led him, in turn, to execute his own son for an act of military disobedience.[35] The execution even

treatment of the authority of the *pater familias* over his household, see Cantarella (2003); see also below p.190-1.

[34] Livy 7.4.4-5.

[35] Livy 8.7.13-22.

'emulates and exceeds' his father's toughness, killing, rather than just mistreating his child.[36] The practical emphasis of the education which Manlius ought to have received is also clear from this passage. His instruction should have been informally given about the household and its hearth, where he would have learnt religious rites, his ancestral history, and skills in household management; about the forum, where he would have heard forensic and epideictic speeches and political debate; and alongside his peers, from whom he would have learnt valuable social skills. This narrative thus confirms the importance of practical, paternal instruction for imagining early Roman education; many of the echoes of which we find in Cato's own attitudes towards his son, Licinianus.

The traditional importance of paternal instruction for a Roman education is also evident in the theatre. Roman comedies produced in the 2nd century BC often feature prominent paternal characters.[37] Although translated from Greek models and superficially set in Greece, these plays were fully immersed in Roman life, culture, and society.[38] These father figures reflect an important element within the instruction with which a Roman *pater familias* would furnish his son: the plays show them frequently offering their sons instruction and advice, given in the form of proverbs, often on topics which were felt to be traditional.[39] These maxims, common to many cultures, must have reflected genuine paternal practice. These proverbs have often been termed as *paterna praecepta*.[40] Plautus depicts a father instructing his son to 'live my way and by the old standards, do what I teach you' (*meo modo et moribus vivito*

[36] Feeney (2010) 210.
[37] The comedies of Caecilius, a later contemporary of Plautus and a contemporary of Cato, are renowned for their portrayals of particularly stern fathers; see Cic. *Cael*. 37.
[38] As demonstrated by Fraenkel (2007).
[39] The later literary tradition continues this idea; Latin didactic prose texts (in a far greater degree than their Greek counterparts) were very often written as though from a father to his son; see LeMoine (1991) 338 n.1; see also below p.206.
[40] Bonner (1977) 17-9. How far these maxims represent a coherent genre is debatable. They might be related to other, prominent early oral forms of *carmen* such as the *convicium*; the relationships between different forms of authoritative speech in archaic Rome is a topic beyond the scope of the present discussion.

*antiquis, / quae ego tibi praecipio, ea facito*).[41] Here the old man Philto refers directly to his educational role within his son's life; in particular, it is his task to instil his son with *moribus antiquis* - traditional Roman virtue and values. In the *Mercator*, the youth, Charinus, recalls the exhortations to hard work and good husbandry which he received from his father Demipho, who was, in turn, recollecting the advice of his own father, 'you're ploughing for yourself, harrowing for yourself, sowing for yourself, and harvesting for yourself; finally, that labour will give joy to you yourself' (*tibi aras, tibi occas, tibi seris, tibi item metis, / tibi denique iste pariet laetitiam labos*).[42] Again, this passage emphasises the sayings of the father as an essential conduit for channelling ancient skills and values to his son.[43] Later authors describe these paternal sayings as something akin to a didactic genre. Cicero has Scipio speak of a familiar stock of paternal advice and of the importance of these 'household maxims' (*domestica praecepta*) within Roman education.[44] Horace caricatures the advice of elders to the younger generation, which typically treats the increase of their substance and the avoidance of avarice: 'listen to the elders, telling the younger generation how their assets could grow and their ruinous greed be reduced' (*maiores audire, minori dicere, per quae / crescere res posset, minui damnosa libido*).[45] Festus also refers to this practice and cites one of these proverbs: 'just as the ancient rhyme maintains, when a father would advise his son in agriculture: 'from the light, dry soil of winter, from the springtime mud, ripened grain, my boy, you will reap'' (*sicut habetur in antiquo carmine, cum pater filio De agricultura praeciperet: 'hiberno pulvere, verno luto, grandia farra, camille, metes*').[46] These extracts from comedy, therefore, belong to a genre - more or less clearly defined - of sayings which

[41] Plaut. *Trin*. 297-8.
[42] Plaut. *Merc*. 71-2.
[43] Plautus sets out the same pattern of grandfather educating father educating son in the proem to his *Mercator* as we find in Livy's account of the three generations of Manlii (Plaut. *Merc*. 46-79). This triad of figures acts as a neat encapsulation of the wider pattern of instruction.
[44] Cic. *Rep*. 1.36; Cicero trains his own, rather reluctant son in a similar fashion (*Planc*. 59).
[45] Hor. *Epist*. 2.1.106-7.
[46] Festus, *Gloss*. *Lat*. p.82 l.19-22 L.

were passed down from father to son. These sayings played an important role within early Roman education; in particular, they were a vital means for transmitting Roman virtue and values from the elder generation to the younger.[47] Their content was wide-ranging; however, it seems to have focussed upon generating wealth, typically through skilled agricultural work and frugality.[48] These sayings reflect the importance of the paternal and practical elements to Roman education. Their popularity on the stage of the 2nd century BC reflects the investment in a vision of traditional Roman education at that time. Cato's works, as we shall see, also engage with this didactic genre.

The father figure also offered an example to be imitated directly. The importance of this example and its educational potential is made clear in a funerary inscription from the 2nd century BC. The occasion of an aristocratic funeral offered several platforms for displaying the great deeds of the *gens* involved; the procession of the ancestor masks and the *laudatio* of the deceased would recall the family's achievements, with the specific aim of encouraging the younger generation to emulate these.[49] Within this context of familial achievement, the relationship between father and son held a particularly significant place. The paternal example is given marked importance in this epitaph, dated to around 135,[50] for Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio Hispanus:[51]

> virtutes generis mieis moribus accumulavi,
>
> progeniem genui, facta patris petiei.

[47] This practice is the natural product of a society in which orality was an 'important feature' (Rawson (2003) 146).
[48] The great increase in Rome's wealth and prosperity during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC led to much theorising about the moral value of the relative sources of such wealth; the preface to Cato's *De agricultura* is the perfect example of this, and the proverbs discussed here also play a part in the trend. For a full discussion of attitudes to wealth during this period, see Gabba (1988) 27-44; 45-8.
[49] Polyb. 6.54.3.
[50] Flower (1996) 169-70; Coarelli (1972) 45.
[51] *CIL* $I^2$.15.

maiorum optenui laudem, ut sibei me esse creatum

laetentur; stirpem nobilitavit honor.

I heaped great deeds on the great deeds of my clan by my good conduct, I have produced children, I have emulated the exploits of my father. I have upheld the repute of my ancestors, so that they rejoice that I was born to them; My honours have ennobled my stock.

In the context of the aristocratic funeral, with its emphasis on familial achievement, the role of the father as an educational example for his sons took on particular importance. The epitaph of Scipio Hispanus cited above not only demonstrates this, but it also highlights the reciprocity with which the relationship between father and son was characterised. While the father, and the ancestors in general, were to provide a practical model of Roman behaviour, the boy himself had a duty to learn from and to emulate this example, accumulating honour for his father and his *gens*.[52] Later authors emphasise even more explicitly that a son should adopt the full likeness of his father: this is the highest form of praise for a young man and the greatest compliment to his father; indeed, it is the ultimate aim of Roman education.[53]

Alongside these theatrical and funerary texts, historical evidence from the 2nd century BC attests to the popular belief at that time in a tradition of paternal and practical instruction as the basis for a Roman education. Cato the Censor deploys a story in his speech against Galba (*Contra Ser. Galbam ad milites*) about a young boy, Papirius Praetextatus, who had followed

[52] Many texts from this period thus emphasise the importance of producing sons to continue the family line and to increase its status. The *laudatio* of Lucius Caecilius Metellus deliverd in 221 highlights the importance of leaving behind children (Plin. *HN* 7.139-40); so too, Cato himself is much concerned with maintaining his own family line (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 24.7) and with maintaining family wealth and property (his support of the *lex Voconia*, which sought to restrict the division of property in bequests left to women makes this clear (*ORF*[3] XL)). This emphasis has often been seen as the consequence of the extinction of many patrician families during the 2nd century BC (Flower (1996) 169 n.36).

[53] Cic. *Fam*. 6.6.13; *Phil*. 9.12; Ov. *Tr*. 4.5.31-2; Plin. *Ep*. 8.13; Juv.14.51-4.

his father into the senate house to learn about its workings and to listen to its debates.[54] The lively story relates how Papirius, on returning home from a day in the *curia* with his father, cleverly deflected his mother's inquiries into the subject of the senate's debate by telling her that they were discussing the merits of polygamy. This news set the city's *matronae* in uproar, much to the amusement of their husbands. More importantly, it carefully concealed the true subject of the debate. To honour the boy's quick thinking, Papirius became the only child allowed to accompany his father into the senate house. Cato told this story in a speech made *ad milites*, a large and largely popular audience,[55] attesting to the widespread belief that Papirius' experience was once a common educational practice.[56] In fact, Polybius also refers to the popular belief that this practical method of training for political life was traditional; however, he himself thought that this particular story of Papirius Praetextatus was ridiculous.[57] This practical training for political life, whatever form it might have taken during the republican past, seems to have been formative for many significant figures from the 2nd century BC onwards. Cato attached himself to his elder connection Fabius Maximus.[58] Cicero recounts the occasions on which Caelius' father conducted the youth into his own presence and that of the estimable M. Crassus.[59] Cicero also records having his own son accompany him to the provinces to gather experience of governorship.[60] Valerius Maximus refers to the practice of contemporary young men following their elders to the *curia*.[61] By accompanying an older man, ideally their father, about his meetings and engagements, a young man would learn from these interactions the codes of conduct and behaviour suitable for public life: essential education for a political career. It might be this element of practical

[54] *ORF*[3] 172.
[55] On the significance of this story within Cato's argument, see Malcovati (1953) *ad loc*.; see also below p.184.
[56] Although the story itself highlights that, even before Cato's day, the practice was becoming rarer and more restricted.
[57] Polyb. 3.20.3.
[58] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 3.4.
[59] Cic. *Cael*. 9.
[60] Cic. *Att*. 5.17.
[61] Val. Max. 2.1.9.

training within the Roman educational system to which Polybius objected so strongly; not only did the historian think that stories such as that of Papirius were ridiculous, but he also believed that the strongly individualised, paternally determined, basis of education in Rome was rather backward.[62] Practical training, typically undertaken by one's father, was thus an important part of a Roman education for several centuries. A range of anecdotal stories arose from the different stages of the development of these methods. The practice formed a popular part of the vision of a traditional Roman education articulated in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC. It was also an important element within the works which Cato the Censor addressed to his son.

The historical realities of Roman educational systems during the early Republic are largely lost to us. However, comparison with other ancient societies suggests that any such system was practically focussed and paternally driven.[63] This is also the picture presented by later historical sources; in particular, the vivid reconstructions of traditional education created by the 2nd century BC stress the importance of these paternal and practical elements. In this period an 'education founded on literary texts and conducted by Greek speakers' is contrasted with an 'older, native primitivist and paternal training in the manly arts'.[64] Historical evidence from Cato and Polybius attests to the widespread popular belief in practical training for political life conducted by following one's father about his daily occupations. Funerary inscriptions confirm the centrality of the father as an educational example. Roman comedies from the period attest to the practical content and pragmatic delivery, in memorable maxims, of the father's teachings. The evidence thus suggests that the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC were heavily invested in articulating a clear and relatively accurate vision of traditional Roman

[62] Cic. *Rep*. 4.3.
[63] On the strongly familial basis of education in ancient China, for example, see Cartier (1996) 491-522.
[64] Bloomer (2011) 2. This contrast, it must be noted, can also be effectively blended, compromised, and combined, see below p.177-8.

education, as part of the narratives of native resistance and reconstruction which accompanied the encroachment of the Hellenistic educational system at Rome during this period. Cato's own writings were deeply engaged with this debate and will be discussed below.

**What was Cato's interest in educational policy?**

Cato the Censor often spoke out on the subject of education. He mentions schools and educational structures in his speeches; several incidents of his involvement in educational policy are recorded by historians and biographers; a wealth of educational proverbs and sayings are attributed to him.[65] The works which Cato addressed to his son have substantial educational connections, and, in addition to these, Cato wrote a range of other didactic works on farming, law, military tactics, and medicine.[66] Throughout his lifetime, then, Cato played an important part in negotiating the encroaching Hellenistic educational system and in constructing the paternal and practical image of a traditional Roman education; this is particularly clear in the works which he addressed to Licinianus. It is on Cato's engagement with contemporary educational issues, particularly within the *Historia*, *Liber ad filium*, and *Epistulae*, that this section will focus.

The first recorded instance of Cato's engagement with educational issues is documented by his biographer Nepos. Cornelius Nepos informs us that Cato brought the poet Ennius to Rome from Sardinia in 204.[67] The decision to convey the poet to Rome was most likely

[65] Schools are mentioned in the *In Pansam* (*ORF*[3] 205) and more practical educational practices in the *Contra Ser. Galbam ad Milites* (*ORF*[3] 172); it is also likely that Cato also spoke of education elsewhere in his public orations which have not come down to us. We know that Cato intervened on the occasion of the Athenian embassy (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 22.7), and as Censor he would have held overall responsibility for the education of the city's youth. On the educational sayings that are associated with him, see above p.35-6.

[66] Subsequent educational writings have also been attributed to the Censor, who was often depicted as a great teacher and mentor to the Roman youth. On the didactic emphasis of received images of Cato, see below p.206-56.

[67] Nep. *Cato* 1.4; [Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill*. 47.1.

motivated by a desire to exploit Ennius' potential as a teacher of Greek language and literature within the education of his household. It is attested elsewhere that Ennius worked as a tutor;[68] it is most probable that he began this work for the figure who oversaw his conduct to the city.[69] In addition to his potential employment of Ennius, we know that Cato owned a Greek slave, Chilon, who was a teacher of sorts; 'he had an accomplished slave teacher named Chilon, who taught many children' (*χαρίεντα δοῦλον εἶχε γραμματιστὴν ὄνομα Χίλωνα, πολλοὺς διδάσκοντα παῖδας*).[70] The description of Chilon as a teacher to 'many children' (*πολλοὺς… παῖδας*) suggests that he taught all of the boys within Cato's houshold;[71] it might indicate that he also taught children, with Cato's support, from outside the household.[72] These instances suggest that Cato was interested in securing successful Greek professionals as teachers within the city of Rome and in promoting a Hellenistic education for the youths of his own household and beyond.

Cato is also connected with contemporary educational developments by a passage of Roman Comedy from this period. The opening of Plautus' *Mostellaria*, a play usually dated to between 200-190,[73] features a lengthy monologue by the youth Philolaches; his speech has long been recognised as a piece of Plautine elaboration,[74] and I believe that it exhibits the influence of Cato's language and diction far more extensively than has been suggested previously.[75] In the passage Philolaches equates the upbringing of a young man with the

[68] Suet. *Gram.* 1.2.
[69] On the continued relationship of Ennius and Cato, see Badian (1971) 151-208.
[70] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.5.
[71] With the exception of his son (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.6).
[72] On the possibility of Chilon teaching in a school, see above p.149 n.4.
[73] The play offers no internal indicators of its date; however, the large amount of song which it contains indicates a late date, probably within the first decade of the 2nd century BC; see de Melo (2011-3) vol. 3 p. 308.
[74] It cannot be ruled out that the monologue was a rhetorical *chreia* of Greek origin; however, the reference to *stipendium* at l.131 is strongly suggestive of Roman invention. For further discussion, see Fraenkel (2007) 117-9.
[75] See also Lentano (1993).

construction of a house. In particular, he highlights the importance of the parents' role in this task:[76]

primumdum parentes fabri liberum sunt:
i fundamentum supstruont liberorum;
extollunt, parant sedulo in firmitatem,
et ut <et> in usum boni et in speciem
poplo sint sibique, hau materiae reparcunt
nec sumptus ibi sumptui esse ducunt;
expoliunt: docent litteras, iura, leges,
sumptu suo et labore
nituntur ut alii sibi esse illorum similis expetant.

First, parents are the builders of their children: they lay their children's foundation. They raise them, eagerly prepare them to be strong, and do not spare their building materials so that they're good for use and an ornament for the people and for themselves; and they don't consider expense to be an expense in that case. They polish them: they teach them literature, law and statutes, and with their expense and hard work it's their ambition that others should want to have children similar to those.

This passage is one of the earliest references to educational practices which we have from a Roman source: it is fully invested in the vision of traditional education which came to be articulated during the 2nd century BC. The parents have a central role in providing for their children's education: this is not only in terms of offering their child moral guidance, but also in personally instructing them in literacy, laws, and statutes. In turn, their children are to be a

[76] Plaut. *Mostell*. 120-8.

credit to their family and to the state. The children are also to be a display of their parents' success: the envy of their peers. These lines thus resonate with the educational concerns, as discussed above, of the period; they stress the paternal and practical nature of traditional education and highlight its possibilities as a platform for display and for elite competition. In particular, these lines resonate with Cato's own take on these concerns. The speech concluded with a direct imitation of a formula commonly found in Cato's own speeches; Philolaches recalls a time, when still under the educational influence of his parents, in which he had been a good man, 'with my thrift and self-discipline I was an example for others' (*parsimonia et duritia discipulinae aliis eram*).[77] The phrase 'thrift and self-discipline' (*parsimonia et duritia*) has been connected with the phraseology of Cato's orations;[78] it is tempting to see Cato's influence not only on this line, but also on the passage as a whole. We know that Cato spoke publicly about education on a number of occasions. There are a number of possible occasions around 190 on which it would have been particularly appropriate for him to discuss the topic; either on the birth of his son, Licinianus, in 192, or as part of his campaign for the censorship in 189. It is possible, then, that the vision of traditional education which Philolaches offers in these lines is expressed entirely in the Censor's own language.[79] We cannot know how much engagement there was with Cato's speeches in passages of Plautus such as this one; however, given Cato's extensive involvement with the educational debates of his age and the clear echoes which we find in particular lines, it seems likely that this engagement was not insubstantial. Therefore this passage alerts us to the possibility that Cato spoke prominently on education and that he was widely parodied in doing so.

[77] Plaut. *Mostell*. 154.
[78] Lentano (1993).
[79] Parody of the language of Cato's speeches is found in Plautus on a variety of other occasions for an extensive dissussion, see Cugusi (1991). It is also possible, of course, that Cato later redeployed Plautine language. On the reciprocity of the censor's relationship with comedy, see below p.187-90.

The earliest educational work which Cato addressed to Licinianus was the *Historia*. This collection of stories, likely taken from the family archives of the Porcii, was written in large letters and was designed to help Licinianus learn to read. In this work Cato offered a distinctly Roman take on the Greek early reader, the *gnomologium*. These gnomologies, which featured morally improving extracts from famous literary works, were the most common resource for learning to read within the Hellenistic world.[80] The *Historia* performed the same function as these gnomologies, but taught basic reading skills with examples of Roman valour and virtue taken from Cato's family history, rather than with general moral maxims taken from famous literature. This preference for learning from explicit *exempla*, rather than from general *praecepta*, has often been constructed as distinctly Roman; it was directly associated by Quintilian with their nature as a people of action, as opposed to the Greeks' nature as a people of words.[81] It seems, then, that the *Historia* was composed as a distinctly Roman alternative to a popular Greek educational tool. Cato not only composed the resources used to teach his son to read, but also undertook the boy's instruction himself, choosing not to involve his slave Chilon in the process.[82] Cato's rejection of the need for the professional tuition and formal educational resources associated with the *enkyklios paideia* was a significant engagement with contemporary educational trends. The *Historia* sees him carefully adapting popular Hellenistic educational resources to traditional Roman structures and subject matters.[83]

[80] Morgan (1998) 120-152.
[81] Leigh (1997) 160-5. Similarly, prominent uses of the Latin *virtus* during this period associate the word strongly with practical military achievement, rather than abstract moral virtue. On this use of the word in the epitaph of Scipio Barbatus (*CIL* $I^2$ .6-7), for example, see McDonnell (2006) 33-5.
[82] Cato is recorded as unwilling either to have his son disciplined by a slave or to have the boy indebted to a man of servile status for his education (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.6).
[83] Some scholars have seen the *Liber ad filium* as a *gnomologium* (Bloomer (2011) 155). While these texts were often dedicated from father to son (Roos (1984) 199-200), and did contain moralistic aphorisms such as are evident in the *Liber*, such readings not only misrepresent the varied tone and content of the *Liber ad Filium*, but they also fail to appreciate the later stage of Licinianus' education which the work addressed, and distinctly underestimate the importance of the *Historia* in this capacity.

The *Liber ad filium*, also addressed by the Censor to his son, offers particular insight into the boy's education. As noted above, the work appears to have its origin as notes used in Licinianus' instruction and it may well have been presented to Licinianus as a prize on his assumption of the *toga virilis*. The polish exhibited by some of the *Liber*'s fragments also suggests that it was circulated beyond its original audience of Cato's son. The *Liber ad filium*, much like the *Historia*, appears to have been designed to engage with contemporary educational debate. The work highlights the practical and paternal dynamics of the education which Licinianus received and the pragmatic manner in which it was delivered.

Cato's personal involvement in the boy's instruction is emphasised with the repeated addresses to Licinianus as *Marce fili* which are found in the *Liber*.[84] In addition, the oracular tone of his advice - Licinianus is instructed to take his father's words as vatic (*hoc puta vatem dixisse*) - encapsulates something of his paternal authority over the boy.[85] The subjects in which Cato instructed Licinianus, as we have them in the extant fragments, are also all strongly associated with the expertise of the *pater familias*: agriculture, medicine, and oratory.[86] In complement to this personal, paternal involvement in Licinianus' education, the work also prominently rejects the consultation of other professional figures for advice, forbidding Licinianus to attend upon doctors (*interdixi tibi de medicis*), and discouraging the extensive study of technical treatises on medical matters (*et quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere*).[87] The instruction and advice offered by his father in this work is to be sufficient for Licinianus' educational needs.

[84] Fs 1, 6, 18.
[85] F1.
[86] On the content of the *Liber ad Filium*, see above p.126. The strength of Cato's antipathy towards Greek medical professionals has even been attributed to a sense that they undermined the traditional role and responsibilities of the *pater familias*; see Von Staden (1996) 369-418.
[87] F1.

The instruction offered, furthermore, is not only paternal, but overwhelmingly practical. Much of the advice given in the *Liber ad filium* is technical in nature and is directly applicable to particular circumstances; Cato discusses, for example, the medicinal properties of hare, how to manage your household staff, and which variety of grape performs best.[88] Where Cato offers more general advice, for example, on the virtue of hard work or the importance of high morals, there are usually rich practical implications.[89] Moreover, this ethical emphasis has been repeatedly identified as a concern of Roman education.[90] Much of the advice offered to Licinianus in these texts is reminiscent of the *paterna praecepta*, as we find them depicted in contemporary Roman Comedy; agricultural matters are the most common subject of instruction in the *Liber*, just as they are in these proverbs, and, at all times, the concern to make a profit prevails. Horace's caricature of these *praecepta*, cited above, can very aptly be compared with Cato's statement to Licinianus that 'it is not the part of a man, but of a widow, to lessen the value of their estate,' (*οὐκ ἀνδρός, ἀλλὰ χήρας γυναικὸς εἶναι τὸ μειῶσαί τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων*).[91] The practical nature and paternal delivery of the instruction found in the *Liber ad filium* thus sets the work within a longstanding tradition of advice handed down from father to son.

The work also expresses something of the oral and occasional nature of the Romans' ideas of their traditional patterns of education. The use of the vocative, *fili*, as well as the second person pronoun, *te*, throughout create the impression of verbal instruction.[92] Furthermore, the varied tone of the work, which includes invective, aphorism, technical detail, and wit, is strongly evocative of informal instruction, orally delivered as and when the occasion arose.

[88] Fs 3, 13, 11, respectively.
[89] Fs 6, 18 with commentary *ad loc.*
[90] On the importance of memorising moral sayings and aphorisms, see Quint. *Inst*. 1.1.35-6; on the character of Roman education more generally, see Rawson (2003) 158.
[91] F17.
[92] Fs 6, 18; F1.

This reflects the pragmatic approach to the education of their children so prominent within the Romans' ideas of their early educational system, with sons gleaning information and guidance from their fathers on different subjects as they arose on a day-to-day basis.

Therefore, the *Liber ad filium*, with its emphases on practical instruction, pragmatically delivered by a paternal figure, promotes contemporary reconstructions of traditional Roman education over and above the increasingly popular Hellenistic *enkyklios paideia*. In particular, it demonstrates Cato's allegiance to the traditional role of the *pater familias* in the education of his household and his investment in the practical content of that education. Indeed, the *Liber ad filium* can be seen to offer a dramatic textualisation of the traditional, oral, form of instruction which was so popularly associated with Rome's past during this period.[93] The *Liber* is thus not to be assimilated with the novel patterns of education being imported from the Hellenistic world, but appears to be in direct competition with them.[94]

The *Epistulae* which Cato sent to Licinianus while the youth was serving on campaign in Macedonia also express overtly didactic aims. These letters offered Licinianus advice on different situations as they arose in his term of service; in one letter Cato gave his son legal directions on his military oath, whilst in another he advocated the advantages of brigands in warfare.[95] In delivering this advice, the letters not only continue to demonstrate Cato's close paternal involvement in his son's education, but they also offer a further attempt to textualise the typically oral instruction long associated with all stages of Roman education. Each new recruit to the army of a certain rank was accompanied on their first period of military service

[93] The decision to turn an oral tradition into a textual one is, of course, itself a notably Hellenised one; on writing as a demonstration of Hellenisation more widely, see Prag and Quinn (2013) 320-47.
[94] Scholars have variously attempted to connect the work to the technical treatise and to the encyclopaedia, both forms developed during the Hellenistic period and which played important roles within its educational system; however, the extant fragments of the *Liber* do not promote such associations; see above p.128-31.
[95] F22, F24.

by an older relative or family friend whose role it was to offer them advice and support.[96] Cato's letters to Licinianus on campaign appear to be a textual estimation of the oral and occasional instruction that would typically be dispensed by this relative. Once again, we see the Censor demonstrating in literary form his central, paternal role in his son's education.

In a final letter to his son, Cato commended the youth's brave actions during the battle of Pydna.[97] This letter also relates to Licinianus' instruction at his father's hands; the youth's heroic behaviour has been read as a result of his excellent education: 'being a youth brought up under the finest instruction and owing a great father a great display of his virtue, he did not think life to be worth living if he let fall to the enemy spoils from his still living body' (*οἷα δὲ νεανίας ἐντεθραμμένος καλλίστοις παιδεύμασι, καὶ μεγάλῳ πατρὶ μεγάλης ἀρετῆς ἀποδείξεις ὀφείλων, οὐ βιωτὸν ἡγησάμενος εἶναι προεμένῳ σκῦλον αὐτοῦ ζῶντος τοῖς πολεμίοις*).[98] The congratulatory letter sent by Cato to Licinianus to mark this occasion must, therefore, simultaneously confirms the young man as a success on the battlefield and his father as a success in the classroom. The *Epistulae*, therefore, call attention once more to Cato's close paternal involvement in his son's education, to his proficiency within this area, and act to publicise that proficiency through a novel, literary medium.

Towards the end of Cato's life, an embassy of great philosophers arrived in Rome from Athens; the young men of the city were captivated by the teachings of these philosophers, and Cato's reaction to this new passion for philosophy reflects his last expression of concern over the state of education in Rome.[99] His biographer Plutarch reports that 'Cato, from the very beginning of when this fervour for discussion slipped into the city, was grieved, afraid that

[96] For a contemporary reference to the practice, see Plaut. *Mostell*. 129-31.
[97] F26.
[98] Plut. *Aem*. 21.2.
[99] On the embassy and its reception see above p.152-3.

the young men, their eagerness for distinction turned in this direction, might desire a repute based on debating rather than on martial deeds,' (*ὁ δὲ Κάτων ἐξ ἀρχῆς τε τοῦ ζήλου τῶν λόγων παραρρέοντος εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἤχθετο, φοβούμενος μὴ τὸ φιλότιμον ἐνταῦθα τρέψαντες οἱ νέοι τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ λέγειν δόξαν ἀγαπήσωσι μᾶλλον τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τῶν στρατειῶν*).[100] His distress caused Cato to intervene in senatorial debate, urging that the embassy be swiftly dispatched from the city, saying that 'and so we must come to a decision quickly and take a vote on the embassy's proposals, so that these men, returning to their schools, can lecture the sons of Greece, while the youth of Rome can attend to their laws and magistrates, as before' (*δεῖν οὖν τὴν ταχίστην γνῶναί τι καὶ ψηφίσασθαι περὶ τῆς πρεσβείας, ὅπως οὗτοι μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς σχολὰς τραπόμενοι διαλέγωνται παισὶν Ἑλλήνων, οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαίων νέοι τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων ὡς πρότερον ἀκούωσι*).[101] Cato's reaction to the embassy once more expressed his preference for what was perceived as a traditionally Roman education, 'attending to the laws and magistrates', rather than the Greek curriculum, which was heavily based around philosophy in its final stages.[102] It also demonstrates his willingness to take on responsibility for the education of the youth of the city, rather than simply those youths within his own household. Cato's actions are a fitting final engagement with the educational debates of his age.[103]

Cato the Censor emerges from this analysis as a figure full of concern for the matter of education. He regularly made his opinions felt in moments of crisis and apparently spoke widely enough upon the topic to become the subject of comic parody. The written works which he addressed to his son were profoundly engaged with the developments within

[100] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22.5.
[101] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22.7.
[102] Morgan (1998) 42-3, 193, 228-9.
[103] Cato's opposition to the presence of the philosophers in Rome was perhaps his most antagonistic response to an element of Greek culture; this opposition displays the strength of his concern for matters of education, and may display an eagerness to distinguish his stance from the rest of the elite, who actively encouraged the Athenians; see below p.173-9.

Roman education during the 2nd century BC. These texts seek to assimilate and adapt Hellenistic forms and to articulate a vision of traditional Roman education. All of these works thus display a strongly paternal focus, practical subject-matter, and a pragmatic form. Cato's concern for education formed an important part of his political activities even into his old age; indeed, as I shall discuss in the following section, Cato's distinctive stance on the subject served as a platform for his self-promotion, singled out amongst the elite as a relative champion of Roman tradition.

**How did this interest relate to the rest of the Roman elite?**

We find many instances during the first half of the 2nd century BC of members of the elite making the education of their children a platform to display their wealth, sophistication, and superiority to other members of their class.[104] The incorporation of elements from the Hellenistic educational system played an important part in this display. These elements, as discussed above, were used to complement Roman virtue and values – extending and expanding traditional education. This use of the Hellenic legacy not only offered 'intellectual enrichment' but also allowed the Romans to confirm that 'that legacy was theirs to command'.[105] Thus prominent members of the Roman elite could reacknowledge and reaffirm their own role in the conquest of the East by incorporating its culture directly into the education of their sons. The attention which Cato drew to his son's education through his written works, and, in particular his careful 'assimilation and rejection of Hellenic

[104] Such competition was certainly not restricted to the 2nd century BC; similar competitive displays of education are made by the likes of Cicero, who emphasised the quality of his own education (Cic. *De or*. 2.1, 3.74), as well as the pains he took in overseeing his son and nephew's instruction (Cic. *Q Fr*. 2.12.2, 3.3.4); Atticus, who also praised his education (Nep. *Att*. 1.2-3); and Horace, who emphasised the efforts that his own father went to in his schooling (Hor. *Sat*. 1.4.105-6, 1.4.121, 1.6.76-7); as well as by Roman freedmen, as when Petronius, for example, has Trimalchio's freedmen boast shamelessly about the education of their sons (Petron. *Sat*. 46.3-8). However, these later displays seem to relate to the status of their protagonists as social aspirants, seeking to assimilate themselves into the upper classes; as such they are rather different to the displays discussed here that were fostered by the culture of intense elite conquest and competition particular to the early 2nd century BC.
[105] Gruen (1992) 252.

educational patterns' within these works, allowed him to play a part in this strand of contemporary elite competition.[106]

A prominent example of this educational display is Cato's peer and rival Fulvius Nobilior.[107] Cicero tells us that Nobilior was heavily engaged in his son's education, taking responsibility for its literary elements and teaching him Greek himself: 'Quintus Nobilior, son of Marcus, is said to have been devoted to the study of language and literature, instructed by his father from boyhood – and it was he who awarded citizenship to Quintus Ennius, who had campaigned with his father in Aetolia, when he founded a colony as a triumvir,' (*Q. Nobiliorem M. F. iam patrio instituto deditum studio litterarum – qui etiam Q. Ennium, qui cum patre eius in Aetolia militaverat, civitate donavit, cum triumvir coloniam deduxisset*).[108] Interestingly, Nobilior undertook to tutor his son personally, even though the family was intimately connected, as this passage indicates, with Ennius, one of the foremost poets and tutors at this time.[109] This involvement in his boy's education, then, allowed Nobilior to demonstrate his own fluency in the Greek language. It also allowed him to maintain the impression of a traditional education for his son, in which the boy was taught privately by his father, with no need for professional assistance.[110] Similarly, Cato also made a point of personal involvement in his son's education. Plutarch's description of Cato's role in Licinianus' tuition is particularly useful here: 'And so Cato himself was the boy's instructor

[106] LeMoine (1991) 345.
[107] Cato and Nobilior appear to have had a rather antagonistic relationship, see below p.179 n.123.
[108] Cic. *Brut*. 79.
[109] Fulvius Nobilior displayed great enthusaism for Greek culture; notably, his temple complex, the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, sought to integrate Hellenistic artistry with Roman poetic tradition. The temple featured statues of the Muses, brought from Greece as booty, alongside statues of the *Camenae*, the native Latin Muses, moved to the temple specially for this purpose. This gesture was also paralleled in Ennius' *Annales*, a work which was likely stored within the temple (Enn. *Ann*. 487 Sk.; on the relationship between this text and the temple itself, see Rüpke (2006)). The move appears to have incurred Cato's ridicule, who makes a pun in one of his speeches on Fulvius' *cognomen*, *nobilior* and the adjective, *mobilior* which would aptly apply to this scenario (*ORF*$^{3}$ 151). For a general discussion of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, see Steinby (1993-2000) vol. 3, 17-9.
[110] The rejection of skilled professionals in preference for paternal instrcution clearly relates to popular ideas of traditional education; however, it may well also be connected to the wider aristocratic preference for innate ability rather than extensive training, which can be found as early as Pindar (*Ol*. 2.86-8).

in languages and literature, his tutor in law, his trainer in athletics, and he taught his son not only to throw a javelin and fight in armour and on horseback, but also to box, to endure heat and cold, and to swim, making headway through the strong currents of the Tiber,' (*ἀλλ' αὐτὸς μὲν ἦν γραμματιστής, αὐτὸς δὲ νομοδιδάκτης, αὐτὸς δὲ γυμναστής, οὐ μόνον ἀκοντίζειν οὐδ' ὁπλομαχεῖν οὐδ' ἱππεύειν διδάσκων τὸν υἱόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ χειρὶ πὺξ παίειν καὶ καῦμα καὶ ψῦχος ἀνέχεσθαι καὶ τὰ δινώδη καὶ τραχύνοντα τοῦ ποταμοῦ διανηχόμενον ἀποβιάζεσθαι*).[111] Plutarch expresses his amazement at the Censor's range of instruction in an ascending tricolon; Cato was not only the boy's *grammatistes*, teaching the boy Latin and Greek, but also his instructor in law, and in athletics. In particular, Plutarch notes the variety of physical skills which Cato taught his son in a tone of admiration: apparently such a broad knowledge was a rare thing.[112] Once again this personal, paternal involvement is in spite of the presence of a Greek professional, in Cato's case the slave Chilon, within the household. This level of paternal involvement highlighted the personal mastery of Cato and Fulvius of Hellenic culture; it also assimilated that culture and its educational patterns into the practice of paternal instruction which was perceived as traditionally Roman. The similarity in the experiences of the young Quintus and Licinianus suggests that such displays of self-sufficiency were an area of direct educational competition for the great Roman *gentes* of this age.

[111] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 20.6.

[112] Plutarch's description of Licinianus' physical training preserves the typical order in which the activities were regularly practised at Rome, with exercises in riding, boxing, and running, followed by swimming in the river Tiber. Plutarch's admiration for Cato's capabilities in these areas is apparently a reflection of Roman thought (on Plutarch's adoption of the perspective of an upper-class Roman gentleman at particular points within his writing, see Pelling (1989) 201); while the Greeks regarded learning to swim as one the two most basic elements of a man's education (the other being learning to read), achievable even by the ignorant (Pl. *Leg*. 689d), the Romans seem to have placed a higher value on the activity, seeing it as a key demonstration of manliness and skill. Virgil's Italians are hardened by swimming in frosty rivers (Verg. *Aen*. 9.603-4); Suetonius has swimming as an 'imperial accomplishment' (Suet. *Aug*. 64.3 with Wardle (2014) *ad loc.*); and both Cicero and Horace describe the activity as an opportunity to display one's strength and vigour, striving in competition with other swimmers; often this is to the delight of those who observe (Cicero accuses Clodia of purchasing gardens specifically to watch swimmers in the Tiber (Cic. *Cael*. 36) and Horace depicts several young women lusting over the athletic bodies of male swimmers in the river (*Carm*. 3.7.27-8, 3.12.7 with Nisbet and Rudd (2004) *ad loc*.)). On the erotic nature of swimming in the Tiber, see also Griffin (1985) 89-90. On the idea of swimming as a demonstration of one's ethnic supremacy and superiority in strength over other peoples, see Hall (1994) 44-80.

Another of Cato's contemporaries, Aemilius Paullus, was particularly engaged in these displays of his children's education. Paullus undertook certain elements of the teaching which his sons received; 'training his sons, not only in the native and ancestral discipline, just as he had been trained himself, but also, rather more eagerly, in that of the Greeks' (*τοὺς παῖδας ἀσκῶν τὴν μὲν ἐπιχώριον παιδείαν καὶ πάτριον ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ἤσκητο, τὴν δ' Ἑλληνικὴν φιλοτιμότερον*).[113] In addition to training his sons in the traditionally Roman elements of their education, Paullus also oversaw the process as a whole; 'their father, unless some public business prevented him, would always be present at their studies and training, since he was by now the fondest parent in Rome' (*ὁ δὲ πατήρ, εἰ μή τι δημόσιον ἐμποδὼν εἴη, παρῆν ἀεὶ μελετῶσι καὶ γυμναζομένοις, φιλοτεκνότατος Ῥωμαίων γενόμενος*).[114] However, the largest portion of his sons' tuition was undertaken by a whole host of Greek specialists, who worked under Aemilius' direction and supplemented his personal expertise: 'for not only the grammarians and philosophers and rhetoricians, but also the sculptors and painters, the keepers of horses and hounds, and the instructors in hunting, about the youths were Greeks' (*οὐ γὰρ μόνον γραμματικοὶ καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ ῥήτορες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλάσται καὶ ζωγράφοι καὶ πώλων καὶ σκυλάκων ἐπιστάται καὶ διδάσκαλοι θήρας Ἕλληνες ἦσαν περὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους*).[115] As with Fulvius and Cato, Paullus' personal involvement in his sons' education connects the new form and subjects which his boys learnt with ancestral didactic traditions. Paullus' employment of a host of Hellenistic scholars to educate his sons acted as a perpetual reminder of the wealth of booty, including these highly educated prisoners of war, which his victories had brought to Rome.[116] In addition to the scholars taken from the Macedonian court, Paullus also sought a teacher for his sons from Athens: 'he requested of

[113] Plut. *Aem*. 6.8.
[114] Plut. *Aem*. 6.10.
[115] Plut. *Aem*. 6.9.
[116] It has even been suggested that the spectacle of the crowd of scholars accompanying Paullus and his sons would have reinvoked, for those who saw them, Paullus' triumph from the Battle of Pydna (Bloomer (2011) 26).

the Athenians to send him their most highly regarded philosopher to instruct his children, and also a painter to adorn his triumphal procession, the Athenians chose Metrodorus, stating that this same man was most distinguished in both requirements,' (*petiisset ab Atheniensibus, ut ii sibi quam probatissimum philosophum mitterent ad erudiendos liberos, item pictorem ad triumphum excolendum, Athenienses Metrodorum elegerunt, professi eundem in utroque desiderio praestantissimum*).[117] Paullus' concern to have his children educated by the very best Greek professionals demonstrates his appreciation for, and mastery of, Hellenic culture. It also highlights the competitive dynamic which education held during this period; Paullus' sons are not just educated by one of the many Greek tutors currently available in Rome and currently tutoring other members of the aristocracy, but by the very best teacher it was possible to procure from the cultural centre of the Greek world.[118]

The curriculum in which Paullus schooled his sons is particularly interesting. As well as instructing them in the traditional Roman manner, Paullus allowed his sons to pursue the most up-to-the-minute of Greek interests and fashions. The children were permitted to take whichever books they chose from the Macedonian royal library as spoils from the defeat of Perses in 168: 'only the books of the king he allowed his sons, who were passionate in their love of learning, to choose for themselves,' (*μόνα τὰ βιβλία τοῦ βασιλέως φιλογραμματοῦσι τοῖς υἱέσιν ἐπέτρεψεν ἐξελέσθαι*).[119] This would have versed the youths in the most recent Hellenistic scholarship. Their curriculum also included sculpture, painting, and hunting, all current trends amongst the Hellenistic courts. Scipio Aemilianus especially enjoyed hunting

[117] Plin. *HN* 35.135.
[118] This incident offers a pleasing answer to Hinds' call for scholars to engage both 'new and old intertextualities', i.e. those between text and historical context and those between text and literary tradition, in our discussions of Latin literature. Hinds emphasises the importance of this engagement in plotting the place of literature in history from 'the inside out as well as the outside in'. So here in the case of Paullus, it is the very height of the skill of the literary practitioner that is of the utmost relevance for our understanding of the historical context, this incident thus offering a happy example of the value of both an 'inside out' and an 'outside in' approach working in tandem, and, as such, forms an excellent example of an early gesture of 'cultural self-positioning'; see Hinds (2001) pp. 223-4.
[119] Plut. *Aem*. 28.11.

and, what's more, he sought to assimilate this novel Greek fashion to traditional Roman values and virtues. Polybius tells us that the youth presented the activity as crucial for developing his courage and stamina, winning him praise and renown. Whilst the other youths spent their days in the forum, trying to court favour, Aemilianus was out in the countryside demonstrating his virtue: 'for the others could not win praise except by injuring some of their fellow citizens, this being the usual consequence of prosecutions in the law courts; but Scipio, without ever vexing a soul, gained his universal reputation for courage, matching his deeds against their words', (*οἷς μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἦν ἐπαίνου τυχεῖν, εἰ μὴ βλάψαιέν τινα τῶν πολιτῶν· ὁ γὰρ τῶν κρίσεων τρόπος τοῦτ' ἐπιφέρειν εἴωθεν· ὁ δ' ἁπλῶς οὐδένα λυπῶν ἐξεφέρετο τὴν ἐπ' ἀνδρείᾳ δόξαν πάνδημον, ἔργῳ πρὸς λόγον ἁμιλλώμενος*).[120] Aemilianus' interest in hunting is presented as the perfect educational activity for developing quintessentially Roman qualities. In this description of Aemilianus' activities, Polybius even uses the traditional opposition of the Romans as a people of action and the Greeks as a people of words to demonstrate the validity of this new pursuit.[121] The behaviours of both Paullus and Aemilianus in this instance demonstrate their dominance over Hellenic culture, making a display of their use of that culture to supplement their Roman values and traditions. The receptiveness of Aemilius and his sons to Greek culture, as presented by Plutarch, was remarkable;[122] however, it is not unrelated to the behaviour of other members of the elite, even that of Cato, who also made similar displays, with a distinctly competitive dynamic, of their assimilation and adaptation of Hellenic culture and Hellenistic educational systems.

[120] Polyb. 31.29.10-1.
[121] Polybius' account offers a very early example of this popular topos.
[122] For Plutarch, the *παιδεία* of his Roman heroes was an important criterion for his analysis of their characters; this emerges in a number of the Roman lives and is particularly prominent in his *Life of Aemilius Paullus*, in which 'concerns about education and culture emerge prominently in a manner which is unrepresentative of the source material' (Swain (1990) 136). Even allowing for potential Plutarchan elaboration on the education of Paullus and his sons, his engagement with Hellenistic educational practices must have been profound; see further, Swain (1990).

In an age which increasingly saw the Greek East as a source of wealth and prestige, the elements of Hellenistic education incorporated by Cato, Nobilior, and Paullus into the training of their sons provided an important platform for the display of the status and success of their families. We find many examples of members of the elite making display of their children's education as a highly competitive gesture. This competition seems to have been based upon the subjects in which their sons were trained, in particular, the balance of Greek and Roman elements and the manner in which these new Greek subjects were assimiliated to traditional Roman educational structures. Grounds for competition were also provided by the tutors employed and the capacity of the father himself to act as a tutor, as well as by the resources used in this tuition. It is notable that this competition is not based upon a binary opposition of 'Greek' and 'Roman' educational systems or distinct circles within Rome's elite who embraced either one or the other system.[123] In fact, these educational displays, and the range of different didactic practices which they highlight, demonstrate the remarkable flexibility and fluidity with which the Roman nobility approached these novel developments in Hellenistic education and their new relationship with Hellenic culture. The display which Cato made of Licinianus' education, most notably through the works of instruction which he addressed to the boy, is just one part of this variegated picture.

## Conclusion

[123] The 'Scipionic circle' once popular with scholars has now largely been disregarded as a Ciceronian fiction; see Gruen (1992) 224-6 with ample bibliography given there. It is difficult to see Cato as in distinct opposition to the rest of the Roman elite, and to Aemilius Paullus in particular; the Censor was, after all, a longstanding friend of Paullus, a father-in-law to one of his daughters (Plut. *Aem*. 5.6; *Cat. Mai*. 20.2), and a surrogate father to his adopted son (Cic. *Rep*. 2.1). Nor is it possible to present Cato as a great antagonist to the Hellenic interests of the elite; aside from Cato's own engagement with Hellenic culture, the only instances of Cato's clear opposition to overtly Hellenised elite practices appear to have far more to do with personal dislike and political expediency than cultural disapproval. It is on these terms that he disapproves of Gaius Acilius for his interest in Greek philosophy (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 22.5-6) and ridicules Postumius for his poorly executed history in Greek (Polyb. 39.1.3; Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 12.6-7), mocks Fulvius Nobilior for his enthusiasm for Hellenistic poetry and its patron goddesses (see above p.174 n.109), and objects to his taking the poet Ennius on campaign with him (*ORF*$^3$ 149).

Education at Rome underwent significant change during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC; in particular, the city saw a growth in the popularity of Hellenic culture and Hellenistic educational practices. This change was accompanied by acts of resistance and attempts to reconstruct an alternative vision of traditional Roman education. Cato's life and his literary works, especially those addressed to Licinianus, were deeply involved in this debate. Alongside his careful adaptation and assimilation of certain Hellenistic practices, Cato appears to have gone some way to promote this vision of traditional Roman education within these works. As such, these texts display close paternal involvement in the boy's education, instruction on practical topics, delivered in a pragmatic manner. The rest of the Roman elite were also profoundly engaged in these developments in education, often making displays of the different sujects and tutors involved in their children's education, which itself became an important platform for personal competition. The educational works which Cato addressed to Licinianus are thus profoundly engaged in cultural debate as a form of political competition during the 2nd century BC.

## 3.2 Father

### Introduction

The paternal relationship which is so prominent in the works that Cato addressed to Licinianus may have been part of a broader use of images of paternity within his public discourse and political career. These images would have been particularly important for securing popular support for the censor – a central concern for politicians of this period. We know that at least one of Cato's speeches engaged in popularised rhetoric about different styles of fatherhood; his military career may have invoked paternal parallels; he also made

use of educational sayings associated with the *pater severus* of the Roman stage within his didactic works; and Cato has been seen as a model for Terence's character of Demea in the *Adelphoe*. It is possible that our limited evidence points to a much more extensive use of the image of the *pater familias* in the courting of popular support which was of such importance for Cato's political career. This section will explore that possibility.

**Paternal Rhetoric**

Paternity offered a highly flexible metaphor for a very wide variety of types of authority within the Roman world. The term *pater* could be used to describe one's political superiors, religious leaders, senators, and elders.[124] In particular, the term *pater* was well established within the military sphere, where it was used widely as a description for one's superiors.[125] It was regularly invoked as an honorifc title for a general who was held in particular affection by his soldiers. The generals who were termed *pater* were popular figures, typically those who were mildest with military discipline and most generous with booty towards their troops; an early example of this is provided by Titus Quinctius, who led his army to victory against the Aequi.[126] Livy attributes the military success of this campaign to the harmony between general and troops (*concordiae ducis exercitusque*), noting that Quinctius distributed the unprecedented amount of booty captured entirely to his soldiers (*nec ullo ante bello latius inde actae praedae. ea omnis militi data est*), and that the soldiers declared Quinctius to have

[124] Individuals higher up the *cursus honorum* were exhorted to treat their juniors as their sons (Plin. *Ep*. 4.15.9); the term *pater* described the head of a priestly *collegium* (*OLD pater* s.v.4b); the appellation *patres* was felt fit for the senate (Cic. *Rep*. 2.14; Sall. *Catil*. 6.6); whilst *pater* was also a respectful address for any older man (Dickey (2002) 120-3). The patricians, too, were termed as *patres*, possibly reflecting either their legal and religious authority over, and responsibility for, the plebs (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.8.1; Isid. *Etym*. 9.3.25); for discussion, see Cornell (1995) 245-51.

[125] Cicero makes clear that relationships between different ranks within the Roman army were framed as father-son bonds; Cic. *De or*. 2.200. The analogy between a commanding general and a father was particularly pertinent; a general's *imperium* over his soldiers was an essential part of the magistracy he held, while a father's authority over his sons was also often imagined as a form of *imperium*; for examples from contemporary comedy, see Plaut. *Bacch*. 459; *Persa* 343; *Trin*. 300-4; Ter. *Phorm*. 232-3; *Haut*. 828, 1055.

[126] Leigh (2004a) 183 n. 106 lists further instances.

been a parent to them (*sibi parentem... datum ab senatu memorans*).[127] There are certain similarities between Quinctius' treatment of his troops in their campaign against the Aequi and Cato's treatment of his troops in his Spanish campaign. Cato's account of his consulship records that he subjected himself, as general, to the same conditions as his troops, drinking the same wine as the rowers (*non aliud vinum bibit quam remiges*); this gesture not only testified to Cato's personal frugality and impeccable use of state resources, but it also sought to promote harmony between the commander and his soldiers.[128] Cato's system for maintaining good discipline amongst his troops was fair and generous; he claims that: 'if anyone had fought vigorously, I would reward them handsomely, so that others might wish to do likewise, and I would praise them copiously in the public assembly' (*si quis strenue fecerat, donabam honeste, ut alii idem vellent facere, atque in contione verbis multis laudabam*);[129] indeed, this clear system of rewards and encouragement is not dissimilar to his treatment of his own son several years later.[130] Furthermore, Cato was remarkably generous in his distribution of the booty from his victories: 'to each one of his soldiers, already rewarded greatly during the campaign, he also gave in addition a pound of silver, saying that it would be better for many Romans to return home with silver than for a few to return with gold,' (*τοῖς μὲν οὖν στρατιώταις πολλὰ παρὰ τὴν στρατείαν ὠφεληθεῖσιν ἔτι καὶ λίτραν ἀργυρίου κατ' ἄνδρα προσδιένειμεν, εἰπὼν ὡς κρεῖττον εἴη πολλοὺς Ῥωμαίων ἀργύριον ἢ χρυσίον ὀλίγους ἔχοντας ἐπανελθεῖν*).[131] In fact, Cato's distributions were some of the most generous that Rome had ever seen, with every infantryman receiving 270 asses and every cavalryman threefold this amount.[132] This evidence strongly suggests that Cato's generalship,

[127] Livy 2.60.1-3.
[128] Plin. *HN* 14.91.
[129] *ORF*$^{3}$ 35.
[130] On hearing of Licinianus' bravery in the battle of Pydna, Cato wrote to his son, 'commending heartily his love of honour and his effort surrounding his sword' (*ὑπερφυῶς ἐπαινοῦντος τὴν περὶ τὸ ξίφος φιλοτιμίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ σπουδήν*); Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.11.
[131] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 10.4.
[132] Livy 34.46.2-3.; Astin (1978) 53-4.

hallmarked by his camaraderie with, encouragement of, and generosity towards his troops, earnt Cato the honorific title of *pater*, just as these qualities had done for many other Roman commanders before him. Cato's speech on his consulship, the *Dierum Dictarum de Consulatu Suo*, emphasised these elements of his command and thus demonstrates Cato's awareness of the value of exploiting the positive paternal qualities of his leadership. The honorific title of *pater*, then, appears to have been a focus for popular support upon which Cato capitalised.

Cato was also aware of the value of stricter images of paternity in appealing to the *populus*; it was this model of fatherhood that he invoked in the *Contra Ser. Galbam ad milites*, a speech given as part of the debate held over the triumph of Aemilius Paullus in 167. The speech, delivered on the Capitol, was addressed to Paullus' assembled troops and was one of several orations which sought to convince the soldiers that Paullus was deserving of a triumph for his victory at Pydna.[133] The senate's decision to award Paullus a triumph had previously led to protests from the troops, who were angered that Aemilius had kept them under strict discipline throughout the campaign and that he had not distributed as much of the spoils to them as they had hoped. Servius Sulpicius Galba, leader of the soldiers' protests, had depicted Paullus as a 'domineering and stingy general' (*imperiosum ducem et malignum*).[134] In the face of this opposition, Cato and his fellow speaker M. Servilius Pulex Geminus, emphasised Aemilius' severity as a positive and paternal aspect of his command.[135] Servilius pointed out the benefits of strict leadership for such avaricious and arrogant troops: 'the generals were helpless, at the mercy of the greed and insolence of their soldiers' (*obnoxios imperatores tradi licentiae atque avaritiae militari*);[136] and compared Paullus to Fabius

[133] An account of the incident is given at Livy 45.35-9.
[134] Livy 45.35.9.
[135] See also Leigh (2004a) 175-89.
[136] Livy 45.36.8.

Maximus, whose strict military discipline with his army during the Second Punic War had helped him to military success, saving the army of his consular colleague, and had seen him given the honorific title of *pater* by those troops whose lives he had saved.[137]

Cato's speech appears to have built upon this image of Paullus as a severe paternal figure, and it likely involved different examples of filial conduct. We know that it included a lengthy anecdote about a youth, Papirius Praetextatus, who displayed respect for his own father and reverence for senatorial protocol, preferring the demands of the *patres* to the entreaties of his mother.[138] The youth has been identified as one of Galba's ancestors, and, in his impeccable conduct towards his father, he would make an excellent example of filial obedience with which to contrast Galba's own disobedience to his general.[139] It is also possible that Cato's speech called upon the example of his own son, Licinianus, who had served with distinction under Paullus, as well as that of Scipio Nasica, Paullus' son-in-law, and Fabius Maximus, Paullus' eldest son, both of whom distinguished themselves in the Macedonian campaigns, most notably, as the first two volunteers for a dangerous and difficult engagement, a display of remarkable filial obedience to their father and general.[140] These examples suggest that Cato's speech emphasised the importance of filial obedience, even to a strict father such as Paullus. Cato's arguments would have drawn further authority from his own paternal success stories, both as a father to his troops in Spain and as a father to his biological son Licinianus in Rome. The extant fragments from the speeches of Servilius and Cato, which were successful in securing Paullus' triumph, suggest that the image of the *pater severus*, just as the *pater mitis*, was appealing and effective in securing popular support.

[137] See Livy 22.29.9-11 with Leigh (2004a) 186-9.
[138] *ORF*$^3$ 172; for the attribution of this speech to this occasion, see Malcovati (1953) *ad loc.* On the context and content of the story, see above p.160-1.
[139] See Malcovati (1953) *ad loc.* However, a Papirius Praetextatus was the patrician colleague of Manius Curius Dentatus in the censorship of 272; Cato's interest in Dentatus is recorded by Plutarch (*Cat. Mai*. 2.1-3) and it is possible that Cato made mention of Papirius in this censorial context.
[140] Plut. *Aem*. 15.1-4.

In both of these incidents we see Cato seek to capture popular support through the use of paternal imagery. In the wake of his own triumph from Spain he seems to have capitalised upon his fair and encouraging approach to military discipline, his solidarity with his soldiers, and generous attitude towards his troops, qualities of command which traditionally earned the a general the title of *pater*. In his support for the triumph of Aemilius Paullus, Cato stressed the importance of filial obedience, above other familial ties and even towards a strict father, in order to secure his friend's success. These incidents demonstrate the appeal of the paternal image, in all its varied manifestations, to the popular audiences that Cato addressed.

**Popular Support**

The importance of popular support for political success during this period is well-attested.[141] The *populus* had an essential place within Rome's electorate, and, while Roman voting procedures were not perfect and certainly were not particularly democratic by modern standards, it was impossible to be voted into a magistracy without an amount of popular support.[142] In particular, after the reorganisation of the *comitia centuriata* by the censors Marcus Fabius Buteo and Gaius Aurelius Cotta in 241, the influence of the lower orders on the outcome of elections had increased significantly. While the plebs tended to follow the choice of candidate made by the nobility, convinced, seemingly, of the ability and respectability of the oldest families, their vote could be swayed by gifts, games, and popular

[141] Recent scholarship has highlighted the importance of such popular support to ensure political success; Millar has argued persuasively for a 'democratic element' during the middle Republic (1984), (1986).
[142] On the increasing competition for such magistracies and corresponding constriction of and clarifications to the ascent of the *cursus honorum* during the late 3rd and early 2nd century BC, see Livy 27.6, 32.7, 32.27, 40.44; on the praetorship in particular, see Brennan (2000).

personalities.[143] It is no surprise that our evidence suggests that politicians went to significant lengths to court the favour of the *populus*.

Cato's own efforts in this area are not to be underestimated. As an aedile in 199 Cato found reason to repeat the Plebeian Games, and to give further games with the associated *Epulum Iovis*, thus helping to secure his election to the praetorship in the following year.[144] In his first campaign for the censorship in 189, Cato keenly opposed the efforts of one of his fellow candidates, Manius Acilius Glabrio, to court the favour of the plebs with the distribution of largesses, seeking to prosecute Glabrio and thus render his candidacy void.[145] In his second campaign for the censorship five years later, Cato sought to appeal to the populace by fiercely opposing personal luxury, figuring himself and his colleague, Valerius Flaccus, as doctors amputating the disease of luxury from the limbs of the city of Rome.[146] Indeed, this opposition to luxury marked much of Cato's political policy; he fiercely opposed the repeal of both the *lex Oppia* and the *lex Orchia*;[147] his censorship was characterised by an opposition to private luxury;[148] and he spoke widely upon the subject.[149] Cato's condemnation of luxurious living was a source of great popular support; with this policy he

[143] Suolahti (1963) 248. These conservative tendencies would have made the election of *novi homines*, such as Cato, all the more difficult; see Suolahti (1963) 307.
[144] Astin (1978) 19-20. Expenditure on games appears to have escalated in following years; Polybius remarks on the elite's use of their new wealth to court the *populus* (Polyb. 6.57.5), and such expenditure was formally limited by the senate in 179 (Livy 40.44.8-12 with Millar (1984) 11).
[145] On Glabrio's popular support, see Livy 37.57.11, 37.58.1-2.
[146] Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 16.6-7.
[147] The *lex Oppia* was originally passed as an emergency measure during the Second Punic War, restricting the luxuries of female dress and carriage; Cato's fierce opposition to the repeal of the law in 195 is recorded by Livy, although it is now widely recognised that Cato's speech on the subject is the historian's creation (Livy 34.1-8). The *lex Orchia* of 181, which restricted the number of guests at a dinner, was the first statute in a string of sumptuary legislation passed during the mid 2nd century BC.
[148] This is the view of his biographer, Nepos (Nep. *Cato* 2.3). Cato repeatedly condemned the luxurious and debauched lifestyles of particular prominent individuals; notably, he justified his exclusion of L. Quinctius Flamininus from the senate on these grounds before the people (Plut. *Flam*. 18-9).
[149] Cato is recorded as speaking directly to the people about the growth of private luxury (Polyb. 31.25.5); he also targeted the greed of his peers, both collectively and as individuals, in a number of speeches; the *De pecunia regis Antiochi* of 187, the censorial speech *Uti Praeda in publicum referatur*, the *In M. Fulvium Nobiliorem* of 178 ), and the *De praeda militibus dividenda* of an unknown date, all dealt with the proper use of Rome's new wealth.

sought 'the arousal, by oratory, of popular resentment and suspicion about the life styles of the rich.'[150] It also allowed him to distinguish his own frugal lifestyle from that of the rest of the elite, and to align it with that of the city's populace at large. This use of 'popular prejudice' not only persuaded the crowd to look favourably upon Cato himself, but it also damned his peers in their sights.[151] Cato's political actions, then, have a distinct populist element, which sought to exploit the support of the plebs for his own advantage.

Cato, with his generous public games and his prominent opposition to luxury, stands out as a central participant in the courting of the populace which was practised by the elite during the early 2nd century BC. It is tempting to think, given the popularity of paternal imagery with the plebs, that Cato may have used the image of himself as a *pater* beyond his consulship, and possibly very widely within his political profile, in order to help him court popular favour. The works which he addressed to Licinianus would certainly have played a part in this image.

***Senex Severus***

The works which the censor addressed to his son clearly promoted his paternal relationship with Licinianus; these texts invoked Cato's careful instruction of the child, his skill and effort in training his first-born, and his pride in the youth's achievement. The themes and topics of this instruction have been shown to be those of the *paterna praecepta*, a loose group of traditional sayings typically addressed from father to son, which are represented most clearly in our evidence by the Roman Comedy produced during this period.[152] Sharing the content and recreating some of the context of these sayings connects Cato very broadly with a

[150] Millar (1986) 6.
[151] Millar (1986) 1.
[152] See above p.157-9; notably, it is these strict and severe fathers who are typically associated with the *paterna praecepta*.

traditional form of fatherhood with which all could identify, a clear bid for popular support.[153]

It is possible that Cato used language and imagery from comedy, and particularly from the stern paternal figures of comedy, more widely within his public discourse.[154] It has long been recognised that Cato's language provided Roman comic playwrights with a valuable rhetorical resource; Catonian phraseology appears in the language of certain characters, comedians reference his speeches, and possibly make allusions to the censor himself.[155] While it is clear that Cato provided a source for comic playwrights, it is also probable that he drew on the resources of comedy for some of his rhetoric.

Cato appears to have made use of the comic character of the overbearing wife, who uses her money to manipulate her husband in his *Suasio legis Voconiae* of 169.[156] In this speech he vividly constructs a narrative based on a bride with a large dowry inheriting further money, witholding it from her husband, and ultimately having him beaten by an old slave of hers, (*postea, ubi irata facta est, servum recepticium sectari atque flagitare virum iubet*).[157] The scenario that Cato constructs is certainly reminiscent of the slapstick violence and

[153] Habinek highlights the popularity of the idea of paternal instruction, 'In popular culture... the place of the ethical pattern, often that of the father, is paramount in the education of the young' ((1987) 195);
[154] The stern father was found in Greek Old Comedy - Strepsiades in Aristophanes' *Clouds* is a good example, and in New Comedy – so Knemon in Menander's *Dyskolos*; he is present in a variety of different manifestations in Plautus, and appears to have been popular with Caecilius, and with Terence. On the various manifestations of the type, see Wehrli (1936) 80-100.
[155] For a full discussion, see Cugusi (1991). On comic parody of Catonian phraseology, see Lentano (1993); for a reference to one of Cato's speeches, see Plaut. *Truculentus* 486 with Enk (1953) *ad loc.*; for a reference to Cato in a complaint of paternal severity, in particular, see Ter. *Haut.* 213-22 with Della Corte (1969) 127; Lefèvre has seen Plautus' *Trinummus* as thematising Cato's moralising ((1990) 38-40), and Vogt-Spira ((2000) 117) sees this element of the play as bitter satire of the inconsistencies in Cato's personal moral outlook and his public policy; it is possible that Plautus makes reference to Cato as a wise man, with a pun on his *cognomen*, at *Pseud*. 678-87; on this see below p.209 n.9.
[156] *ORF*$^{3}$ XL; Plutarch also quotes Cato as saying that the Romans were ruled by their wives (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 8.4). For the type of the well-dowered wife, see particulary Artemona of Plautus' *Asinaria*, whose husband remarks that 'I took the money and sold my authority for the dowry' (*argentum accepi, dote imperium vendidi*) (l.87); see also Caec. 141-57 *CRF*$^{3}$ Ribbeck; Ps. Quint. *Decl. Min.* 257.8, 301.20 with Winterbottom (1984) *ad loc.*; Sen. *Controv.* 1.6.
[157] *ORF*$^{3}$158.

domineering slaves widely associated with Plautine comedy. Cato's speech *De Dote* also invokes a typical comic type in derision of female behaviour, in this instance recalling the adultery scene, a common set-piece of these plays.[158] These speeches show that Cato repeatedly reverted to negative comic stereotypes to describe the behaviour of women. While there is an element of the ridiculous in the scenarios described, Cato clearly felt that these comic types offered a suitably accurate representation of the behaviour of real-life women, that he could successfully employ them in support of legislation for the proper governance of female marital relations and matters of inheritance.[159] These citations show that Cato was ready to draw upon comedy as a resource for his speeches and that both he and his audiences were happy to take the behaviour of its characters as of relevance to reality.

Notably, many of the negative female stereotypes which populate Cato's speeches were regularly propounded by the *senex severus* of the comic stage.[160] These conservative characters often share some of the traits which Cato sought so publicly to promote for himself; they are frugal, fiercely opposed to luxury, and from an agricultural background.[161] This commonality raises the possibility that Cato deliberately adopted the language and imagery of this comic character at particular points within his career. While it is unlikely that Cato sought widespread identification with such a figure, who was often an unappealling

[158] *ORF*[3] LXIX.
[159] Correspondingly, the list of female clothing found at Plaut. *Epidicus* 222-35 and the female expenses listed at Plaut. *Aulularia* 505-23, 525-36 may owe something to the language of the debates over the repeal of the *lex Oppia*.
[160] Callicles bemoans the deceptive nature of women (Plaut. *Truculentus* 775-83); Euclio fears that he may be robbed by his housekeeper (Plaut. *Aulularia* 52-66); Megadorus laments the headstrong nature of a well-dowered wife (Plaut. *Aulularia* 475-95, 498-503); Demipho suggests that a beautiful woman is of immoral character (Plaut. *Merc*. 394-417).
[161] Demipho, although revealed as a hypocrite in the course of the play, was brought up in poverty on a farm (Plaut. *Merc*. 65-77); Demea continues to farm, maintaining a frugal lifestyle, inspite of the fact that he is now very wealthy (Ter. *Ad*. 45-6; 502-6); Menedemus voluntarily inflicts a life of poverty and agricultural labour upon himself as a way to atone for his behaviour towards his son (Ter. *Haut*. 136-9). On the 'naturale convergenza' between Cato and these characters, see La Penna (1987). On Plautus and Cato as sharing political views more generally, see the bibliography given at Garbarino (1973) 545 n.2; while much of this scholarship relies upon an out-dated view of Cato as an ardent anti-Hellenist, the emphasis on a shared antipathy towards luxury is still of relevance here.

character with an unfortunate end, the *senex severus* would have offered a valuable resource for Cato's rhetoric against luxury.[162] The populist nature of this policy has been outlined above, and it would be a small step for Cato to employ some of the language and imagery of the more sympathetic elements of this popular character, in an area in which he deliberately sought to appeal directly to the plebs.[163] This redeployment of images associated with the *senex severus* would enliven Cato's speeches on the subject, calling to mind some of the audience's favourite comic characters, in support of a cause which favoured their interests and appealed to their conservative tendencies. The exact nature of the relationship between Catonian rhetoric and the stereotypes of Roman Comedy is beyond the scope of our extant evidence; however, I would like to suggest that this relationship was far more reciprocal than has been noted previously, and, in particular, that Cato may have drawn directly upon strict paternal imagery in his popular anti-luxury policies.

**Paternal Authority**

Cato's use of paternal imagery in the aftermath of his military campaigns as consul, in the works which he addressed to Licinianus, and in his rhetoric against luxury, sought to harness the authority and antiquity of the figure. The Roman *pater familias* held marked authority, *patria potestas*, over his household.[164] *Patria potestas* saw the father hold legal and moral

[162] The *senex severus* was often a singularly unappealing character, strict in relation to his son, often miserly, frequently hypocritical, and typically rendered a fool as part of the play's finale (Plaut. *Mostell*. 1146-7; *Bacch*. 1099-101; *Capt*. 781-7; *Epidicus* 521). Wholescale identification with such a figure would certainly not be welcome to Cato. Nor is such identification compatible with what we know of Cato's interests, attitudes, and policies (the idea of Cato as an ardent conservative and anti-Hellenistic has now finally been put to rest; see Gruen (1992) 52-83). Indeed, the identification of Cato even with one such figure, Terence's character Demea, has now been broadly rejected, with growing concern for disconnect between content and context causing the work of Lana (1947), MacKendrick (1954) and Trencsényi-Waldapfel (1957) to be abandoned; while the renewed historical approach offered by Leigh ((2004a) 158-91) is far more plausible, such one for one identification should be treated with great caution.

[163] Notably, the comedian Caecilius, whose *floruit* in the 180s coincided with the peak of Cato's political activity, was particularly famous for his *senes severi* and it is possible that some of the character's popularity was exploited by Cato (Cic. *Cael*. 37); Cicero even has his character Cato also quote Caecilius, suggesting that the real Cato may also have done so (Cic. *Sen*. 24, 36).

[164] Ancient authors expressed amazement at the authority of the *pater familias* over the life and death of his children (Gai. *Inst*. 1.55; *Inst*. *Iust*. 1.9.2.; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.26.4). While modern scholarship has thrown

authority over his sons, responsible for overseeing their behaviour, decisions, and discipline, who were bound in obedience to him until the time of his death.[165] These responsibilities relied upon the ability of the *pater familias* to uphold the *mos maiorum* – the precedent passed down to him by his forefathers – in the outlook of his children. It was a powerful image, and one which may have had particular resonance for Cato's censorial ambitions. Much of the authority and antiquity with which the *pater familias* was endowed was also attributed, on a larger scale, to the censors. These men were responsible, in the *regimen morum*, for upholding Rome's ancestral values in her present-day citizens, all of whom were legally bound in obedience to the censors.[166] No Roman source directly connects the authority of the *censores* with that of the *pater familias*, although several play upon the clear parallels between these two figures.[167] These parallels make it tempting to think that Cato, in his campaign for the most conservative of magistracies, made use of paternal imagery to enhance his claims to the authority and antiquity required of the office. The works addressed to Licinianus played an important part in this and they are discussed in detail below.

**Conclusion**

Paternal imagery was a popular piece of rhetoric in republican Rome. In parallel incidents at opposite ends of his political career, Cato sought to emphasise his own paternal qualities and those of his friend Aemilius Paullus in their respective military campaigns; these speeches, although they both centred upon very different images of fatherhood, were well received by their popular audiences. In the context of Cato's prominent courting of popular support it

considerable doubt on the potency of such authority in practice (Saller (1986)), *patria potestas* remained an important ideal; enshrined in the earliest legislation (XII Tables IV.2), it was the frequent subject of rhetorical debates, and part of the broad cultural emphasis placed by the Romans on filial obedience as part of their particular quality of *pietas*.

[165] This responsibility could only be discharged if your father sold you into slavery three times; XII Tables IV.2.

[166] Suolahti (1963) 26. On the distinctly patrician, and hence paternal, nature of the office, see below p.192-7.

[167] Cicero's depiction of Appius Claudius Caecus as a figure of supreme paternal and censorial authority (Cic. *Sen.* 37) and Horace's depiction of his own father's keen moral regime (Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.105-6, 116-9) are both suggestive of the Romans' assimilation of the two figures. Late sources do refer to certain magistrates as *patres*, but these do not include the censorship; see *TLL* s.v. *pater, -ris*, 10.1.679.55ff.

seems probable that he made use of paternal imagery more widely within his political profile. As part of this paternal imagery, the works which Cato addressed to Licinianus demonstrated his parental abilities and align him with a long and popular tradition of paternal instruction; in addition, Cato's use of language of the *senex severus* from comedy enlivened this paternal image, the popular character providing the censor with a vivid rhetorical resource for his campaign against luxury in particular. This paternal image was particularly significant for Cato's campaign for the censorship as well as an important hallmark of his political career more broadly.

## 3.3 Censor

### Introduction

The censorship was Rome's highest civil accolade and Cato's attainment of the office was the greatest achievement of his career.[168] Cato's election as the plebeian censor for 184 was also his hardest fought political battle; Cato had campaigned unsuccessfully for the office in 189, and was only elected, in the face of fierce competition and significant opposition from the established nobility, after running again for the following term five years later.[169] Cato's longstanding friend and peer Valerius Flaccus acted as his patrician running mate and as his

[168] The censorship began as a magistracy, originally reserved for patricians, in 443 (Livy 4.8.5; Zonar. 7.19). The office appears to have arisen out of the general responsibility of the patrician *gentes* to watch over the morals of their members, particularly in the period prior to the XII tables, when they administered the law itself (Suolahti (1963) 20-5). While the first plebeian censor was elected in 351 (Livy 7.22.7, 10.8.8) and it was declared that one censor must be plebeian in 339 (Livy 8.12.6), the office seems to have retained its connections to this informal patrician guardianship.

[169] Livy 39.41.1-4. While the office did see more plebeians admitted in subsequent years, overall, 86% of censors were from *gentes nobiles* (Suolahti (1963) 518). As Cato's struggles in the early 2nd century BC show, those censors who arose from outside consular *gentes* only did so with the utmost exertion and with elite sponsorship. It is notable that even as an established equestrian (Cato's grandfather was a knight (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 1.1)), whose family had made significant inroads into the political elite (a L. Porcius Licinius was aedile in 210 and praetor in 207; a P. Porcius Laeca was praetor 195), and who had, himself attained the consulship, an office endowed with *imperium* and thus of far greater power than the censorship, Cato still struggled to be elected.

colleague in the office. The rhetoric employed by Cato in his campaign for office, while conducting his duties, and later in justifying his actions as censor, was rich in images of his pristine personal virtue, his practical skills, and his vigorous and disciplined lifestyle, all of which he aptly embodied within the figure of the agriculturalist.[170] Much of this rhetoric was constructed to counter his opponents' protestations against his status as a political newcomer and it appears to have become an important part of the imagery associated with the *novus homo* in the 1st century BC.[171] Indeed, this rhetoric came to characterise not only Cato's political career, but also his prose works.[172] This section looks, in particular, at the role that the works addressed to Licinianus played in creating this image of old-fashioned agricultural virtue, skill, and discipline that was so effective within Cato's censorial career.[173]

**The *lustrum***

The *lustrum* formed the conclusion and culmination of the office of censorship. This rite, which required the sacrificial victims - a sow, a sheep, and an ox - to be driven around the Campus Martius before being duly slaughtered to the god Mars, was conducted on completion of the census and at the very end of the censors' term in office.[174] The *lustrum*

[170] On Cato's rustic and rural self-fashioning, see Reay (2005), (2012); Sciarrino (2011) 143.
[171] On the relationship between Cato's rhetoric and that of *novi homines* such as Cicero, see below p.204 n.211.
[172] On Cato's words as the embodiment of his person, see Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 1.5; Plin. *HN* 29.13. Sciarrino rightly asserts the 'pivotal role that Cato's censorial experience played in his prose' and she holds the office itself may even have suggested the composition and circulation of his prose works to Cato. The Censorship invested great importance in the written word, with the censor reading the household accounts of the citizens as part of the *lectio*. Cato's own writings, all broadly connected to the management of his own household, his experience, and expertise, may well have been prompted by this practice (Sciarrino (2011) 170-9, 199). The connection between political newcomers and novel artistic experimentation can already be seen in the innovative monuments created by the plebeian triumphators of the 3rd century BC (Kondratieff (2004) 7-8).
[173] Cato was not unique in his connection of agricultural activity to ancient virtue and upright morality. Images of austerity were part of the ideology of the Roman generals waging war on wealthy Italian peoples in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC (Dench (1995) 82); the early plebeian censors also made use of the images in their efforts to prove they possessed the moral authority and antiquity necessary for this patrician office (on Fabricius and Dentatus, for example, see below p.196-7); while Cato's elite peers, most notably Scipio Africanus during the period of his exile, employed this imagery in confirmation of their incorruptibility and imperviousness to Rome's new found riches (Sen. *Ep*. 86.5).
[174] This type of sacrifice was known as the *suovetaurilia* (Livy 1.42.4-44.2; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 4.22). The *suovetaurilia* was just one form of *lustratio*; the rite itself seems to have been highly flexible – it served for the purification of anything from small farmsteads to the whole Roman community. The *lustratio* variously

sought to purify, protect, and ensure the prosperity of the newly registered Roman citizen body.[175] Cato was responsible for taking the *lustrum* which completed his term as censor. Shortly after the event, the auspiciousness of Cato's *lustrum* was contested, and it was with claims to piety and virtue validated by his agricultural upbringing that Cato met this challenge.[176] Several fragments from a speech of Cato's defending the auspiciousness of his *lustrum* have come down to us;[177] The speech, typically dated to 183, appears to have described the rite and the good harvest which it secured for the following year.[178] The speech also emphasised Cato's personal piety, an important quality for ensuring the favour of the gods and the effectiveness of the *lustrum*; 'even from my earliest days, in frugality and austerity and hard work, I led a consistently restrained youth by tending the land, amidst the Sabine rocks, digging over and sowing the stony ground.' (*ego iam a principio in parsimonia atque in duritia atque industria omnem adulescentiam meam abstinui agro colendo, saxis Sabinis, silicibus repastinandis atque conserendis*).[179] In these words, Cato uses his early agricultural experiences to act as a guarantee of his personal piety. Engaged in agricultural labour, he did not have the opportunity to indulge in any luxurious or loose-living activities, 'I led a consistently restrained youth' (*omnem adulescentiam meam abstinui*); while the hardships of his existence 'in frugality and austerity,' (*in parsimonia atque in duritia*), demonstrate his capacity for good discipline and hard work;[180] and the remoteness of his

provided purification, protection, and prosperity, as required. For further discussion, see *Brill's New Pauly* s.v. *lustratio* cols. 892-3.

[175] The *lustrum* was the 'special purification conducted by the *censores* after the census in Rome'; the rite was thought to guarantee the prosperity of the city of Rome for the following five years until the next *lustrum* was performed (*Brill's New Pauly* s.v. *lustrum* col. 893).

[176] The *lustrum* was first performed by a plebeian censor in 219 (Livy, *Per*. 13; *Fasti Capitolini* a 280); it is probable that the opposition to Cato's *lustrum* was, at least in part, motivated by the fact that he was one of the first plebeians, and probably the first *novus homo* to perform it.

[177] The speech is transmitted under two different titles; both as the *De suis virtutibus contra <L.> Thermum post censuram* and as the *De lustri sui felicitate*; see Malcovati (1953) *ad loc.*

[178] *ORF*$^{3}$ 134-5.

[179] *ORF*$^{3}$ 128.

[180] Cato emphasises his hard work within the course of the censorship in the *Ad litis censorias*: 'I have done my best, not sparing my own hard work,' (*quod in me esset, meo labori non parsi*); *ORF*$^{3}$ 122.

location ‘amidst the Sabine rocks,’ (*saxis Sabinis*) creates a sense of simplicity and cultural purity.[181]

The moral virtue which Cato implicitly attaches to his agricultural activities in this speech, he connects explicitly with them elsewhere. The *Liber ad filium* extolls the moral value of hard work, claiming that ‘the good man’ is ‘an experienced husbandman whose tools gleam’ (*vir bonus est... colendi peritus, cuius ferramenta splendent*).[182] The *De agricultura* goes even further than this, claiming that; ‘yet the bravest men and the most vigorous soldiers are sprung from farming stock, their livelihood is the most honourable and the most secure, and it evokes the least envy, and those who are engaged in that pursuit are the least likely to be deceitful,’ (*at ex agricolis et viri fortissimi et milites strenuissimi gignuntur, maximeque pius quaestus stabilissimusque consequitur minimeque invidiosus, minimeque male cogitantes sunt qui in eo studio occupati sunt*).[183] Here Cato directly states that the agriculturalist is, by nature, a morally better and more devout man than those engaged in other professions. Further to this, he also holds that the ancestors not only practised agriculture, but also used it as their currency of value; ‘and when they [our ancestors] praised a good man, they praised him in this way: as a good farmer and a good husbandman; one who was praised in this was thought to be praised most fully,’ (*et virum bonum quom laudabant, ita laudabant: bonum agricolam bonumque colonum; amplissime laudari existimabatur qui ita laudabatur*).[184] These lines attest to the antiquity of agricultural activities and provide ancestral precedent for their value. The ideology of agriculture expressed in Cato’s works at large informs the

[181] The geographical sweep of Sabine territory was remarkably varied (Strabo 5.3.1), but Cato sets his own labours amidst the remote and rough upland areas, as is apparent in his phrase *saxis Sabinis*. For a useful discussion of the diverse terrain of the Sabine peoples (though the neat dichotomy set out here is surely to be rejected), see Musti (1985).
[182] F6. This connection between moral rectitude and physical labour is found throughout Cato’s work; see Dench (1995) 84.
[183] Cato, *Agr. praef.* 4.
[184] Cato, *Agr. praef.* 2.

censor's self-presentation. Cato's own practice of farming, as he calls attention to it in his speeches, offered proof of the personal virtue which was essential to ensure the success of his all duties as censor, and particularly to confirm the auspiciousness his *lustrum*.[185]

The location of Cato's agricultural activities, amidst the harsh uplands of the Sabine territories, seeks to counter the challenge to his *lustrum* with a particular censorial precedent. A string of plebeian censors from the previous century, most prominently Gaius Fabricius Luscinus, censor in 275, and Manius Curius Dentatus, censor in 272, had become associated with images of agricultural labour, frugality, and piety.[186] Cato appears to have sought to foster a connection between himself and the figure of Dentatus in particular. Cicero and Plutarch relate that Cato regularly visited the site of Dentatus' cottage on Sabine lands and that he took inspiration from the former censor's lifestlye, an anecdote that likely featured in Cato's own rhetoric.[187] Cato's location of his labours in Sabine territory appears to be a deliberate decision to further this connection. The Porcii are recorded in our sources as coming from Tusculum, and, while it is likely that as an equestrian family, they owned a substantial amount of land around Latium, and quite possible that Cato spent time on one or more of these estates, it is nevertheless remarkable that Cato chose to make Sabine territory the setting for his early agricultural labour. Elsewhere in his writings, Cato attests to the austerity and piety of the Sabines; recalling their partially Spartan origins (*Cato autem et Gellius a Sabo Lacedaemonio trahere eos originem referunt*), and noting the role of these

[185] On the agriculture of the villa as a demonstration of republican virtue, see Wallace-Hadrill (1998).

[186] References to the proverbial frugality and austerity of this pair are manifold. On Fabricius, see, for example, Livy, *Per*. 13-4; Hor. *Carm*. 1.12.37-44; Val. Max. 2.9.4, 4.3.6; Gell. *NA* 1.14; Plut. *Pyrrh*. 20. On Curius, see, for example, Cic. *Rep*. 3.6; *Paradoxa Stoicorum* 1.12; Hor. *Carm*. 1.12.37-44; Livy, *Per*. 14; Juv. 11.78-9; Plin. *HN* 19.87; Val. Max. 4.3.5; Flor. 1.13.21-3; Plut. *Mor*. 194e-f; Ath. 10.419a; [Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill*. 33.7. Cicero often lists Fabricius and Curius together; see, for example, Cic. *Paradoxa Stoicorum* 1.12 and *Rep*. 3.40 with Van der Blom (2010) 161).

[187] Cic. *Rep*. 3.40; Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 2.1; Cicero also has Cato praise Dentatus further at *Sen*. 55. While it is possible that the connection between Cato and Dentatus was a Ciceronian fiction, Cicero's own visits to the site of Dentatus' cottage make far more sense as an imitation of Cato's earlier gestures of esteem for the censor (Cic. *Leg*. 2.3).

qualities in Roman character (*Sabinorum etiam mores populum Romanum secutum idem Cato dicit*).[188] While he writes in an established tradition depicting Sabine frugality and austerity, Cato offers our first literary attestation to these ideas, and appears to articulate a view which was counter to that of his contemporaries, several of whom dwell, instead, upon the historical luxury and wealth of the Sabine peoples.[189] Cato's writings, then, represent a decisive and deliberate investment in the austerity and piety of the Sabine peoples, a conscious shaping of his own experiences to fit in with these traditions, and a clear desire to connect these ideas and experiences with Manius Curius Dentatus.[190] The successes of this plebeian censor no doubt added valuable precedent for Cato's own actions in office.

The agricultural imagery of Cato's speeches, reinforced by the ideology which he articulates in the *Liber ad filium* and the *De agricultura*, then, offers proof of his personal piety, seeking to confirm the success of his censorial *lustrum*. These agricultural images appear to have featured in the rhetoric of previous plebeian censors and Cato seeks to connect himself with these men, creating a pertinent precedent for his own censorial actions.

**The *Lectio***

[188] Fs 50-1 *FRHist.* with commentary *ad loc.*

[189] These ideas of Sabine frugality and austerity are certainly not Cato's own creation (we know that the Tarentines of the 4th century BC invoked claims of kinship with the Sabellian peoples based upon their shared Spartan origins; see Strabo 5.4.12 with Dench (1995) 53-61); however, Cato forms our first literary attestation to the association of these qualities with the Sabines. Notably, Cato's impression of the Sabines is in contradiction with other contemporary written sources, which testify to the ancient wealth and luxury of this people; Ennius, for example, depicts their ruler in the time of Romulus, Tatius, as a tyrant (*Ann*. 104 Sk.), and both Cincius Alimentus (F3 *FRHist*.) and Fabius Pictor (F7 *FRHist*.) note his wealth; Fabius Pictor also attests to the wealth that the conquest of Sabine territory brought to Rome (F24 *FRHist.* with commentary *ad loc.*; Pictor's notoriously ambiguous phrase may not attest to the fabulous wealth of the Sabines, but it seems likely to imply that through the Sabines the Romans were significantly enriched). It appears, then, that Cato's development of the Sabines as a people of historic austerity and frugality represents a choice between a variety of different available traditions. While it is clear that Rome's depiction of her conquered enemies was a complex, and continually shifting construction (see discussion in Dench (1995) 85-94), I would like to see significant personal motivation as an element in Cato's choice.

[190] Indeed, the impression of Dentatus found in 1st century BC sources may well be one of distinctly Catonian colouring.

Cato's agricultural writings complement his censorial duty to oversee the proper maintenance of land and property. The censors required Rome's leading citizens to see that their estates were well kept and to keep accounts of their expenses in regard to their property.[191] In order to meet this requirement, landowners could be asked to read their household accounts aloud in the presence of the censors. Those found wanting in this area could be branded with a *nota* and have their names removed in the censors' *lectio senatus*.[192] Sources state that during his term of office Cato was very vigilant in ensuring that landowners paid due care and attention to the maintenance of their property:[193]

si quis agrum suum passus fuerat sordescere eumque indiligenter curabat ac neque araverat neque purgaverat, sive quis arborem suam vineamque habuerat derelictui, non id sine poena fuit, sed erat opus censorium, censoresque aerarium faciebant. item, quis eques Romanus equum habere gracilentum aut parum nitidum visus erat, 'inpolitiae' notabatur; id verbum significat quasi tu dicas 'incuriae'. cuius rei utriusque auctoritates sunt et M. Cato id saepenumero adtestatus est.

If anyone had allowed his land to grow wild and was not caring for it properly, if he had neither ploughed nor weeded it, or if anyone's orchard or vineyard was in a state of neglect, this did not go unpunished, but it was a task for the censors, who would reduce such a man to the lowest class of citizens. In the same way, any Roman knight whose horse seemed too thin or was not sufficiently well groomed, was charged with *inpolitae*; a word which means the

[191] Gell. *NA* 4.12.1; Plin. *HN* 18.11, 32; Cic. *De or*. 2.287; these concerns fall within the scope of the censors' *regimen morum*, the duty to care for the morals of the citizens; such concerns natually focussed upon the upper orders of Roman society.
[192] Suolahti (1963) 47-56.
[193] *ORF*$^{3}$ 124 = Gell. *NA* 4.12.1-3. On the notoriously exacting terms of Cato's censorship, see below p.201 n.203.

same as negligence. There are authorities for both these punishments, and Marcus Cato has cited frequent instances.

Cato's censorial speeches provide further evidence for his diligence on this account. We have a fragment from the *In L. Furium de aqua*, in which Cato admonishes the behaviour of a certain wealthy landowner who was unfairly channelling a public water source to irrigate his estates.[194] We also find several titles which are suggestive of orations dealing with technical agricultural matters, presumably advising landowners on particular practices and encouraging proper care for their land. These include a *De agna musta pascenda*;[195] a *De fundo oleario*;[196] and a *De laetorio*, the sole surviving fragment of which mentions 'a donkey or a wild sheep or a ram' (*asinum aut musimonem aut arietem*).[197] Cato pursued his censorial responsibility for the proper care of property with exactitude; the Censor appears to have made use of his agricultural writings to justify this strict treatment of landowners with poor household practices.

In both the *Liber ad filium* and the *De agricultura* Cato clearly demonstrated his own skills and abilities as a landowner. The *De agricultura*, in particular, made a display of Cato's practical skills and personal expertise in its depiction of the running of his estate.[198] These works even covered topics which Cato had treated in his censorial speeches; the *De*

[194] *ORF*$^{3}$ XXIII. Cato continued to discuss questions of irrigation, mentioning the matter in a speech *In M. Fulvium Nobiliorem* (*ORF*$^{3}$ 150); this speech is thought to have been delivered in 178, and it is probable that Cato recalled his own actions on the improper use of public water whilst making an accusation about Nobilior's censorial conduct of the previous year.
[195] *ORF*$^{3}$ XVII.
[196] *ORF*$^{3}$ XXV.
[197] *ORF*$^{3}$ 108.
[198] The work's rough qualities, haphazard structure, and the very specific directions which it gives show the *De agricultura* to be derived from Cato's own household notes; see above p.22 n.41. The work thus provides proof of Cato's abilities as an agriculturalist. While some scholars have claimed that Cato's circulation of such household notes was almost accidental (Astin (1978) 220), widespread evidence for Cato's clever political strategy suggests that he had a clear purpose in publishing such practically-oriented, personal products.

*agricultura* gave directions on the harvest and storage of olives and the production of olive oil, material which must have featured in the *De fundo oleario*;[199] while the *Liber ad filium* gave guidance on the use of the ass, providing an overlap of material with the *De laetorio*.[200] This reiteration of his technical expertise affirmed Cato's ability to admonish and advise other landowners as part of his censorial duties. In particular, the display made his own methods of household management public – a gesture not dissimilar to the rendering of account before the censors - clearly demonstrating that Cato's own personal practices were above censorial reproach.[201]

These works also recreate the censorial procedure of calling upon citizens for their accounts within their text. In one of the early chapters of the *De agricultura* we find the landowner calling his *vilicus* to account for the state of his property.[202] As the landowner inquires about the money spent on the farm, the tasks which have been completed, and those which have not, we are reminded of the censorial procedure, in which Cato called to account many a citizen. The *Liber ad filium*, too, offered instruction in how to manage household staff, and comparison with the *De Agricultura* suggests that this work also included advice on bringing

[199] Cato, *Agr*. 10, 12-3, 18, 44-6, 53-69, 100, 144-6.
[200] F16.
[201] The exhaustive technical detail of the *De agricultura* places the work firmly within the context of inter-elite competition over advances in agriculture, or 'competitive gardening', to use Fentress' term (Prag and Quinn (2013) 167-72). Plutarch's description of the encyclopaedic spirit of the work, *ἐν παντὶ φιλοτιμούμενος περιττὸς εἶναι καὶ ἴδιος* (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 25.3), certainly complements this picture. Plutarch's usage of this pair of adjectives is rare; it occurs only ten times in his corpus and only four times in the *Parallel Lives*; it's application in the two other Roman lives in which it features is positive, describing in each case, a singular, positive attribute of a Roman leader (*Fabius Maximus* 1.8; *Aem*. 38.2). The term *περιττός*, had distinctly Alexandrian associations. The word is used to positively, to denote the quality of 'sophisticated exquisite erudition' found in Hellenistic poetry (Wiseman (1979) 152), and is used in this sense to describe Gallus' art by Parthenius in the proem to the *Erotica Pathemata* (see Lightfoot (1999) *ad loc*.), as well as negatively, to refer to the accumulation of obscure and unnecessary detail, and is used in this manner by Plutarch of Antimachus, a poet so verbose that his reader is rendered *περιττὸς καὶ ἀδολέσχης* (Plut. *Mor*. 513A-B). On the double-edged use of *περιττός* as a critical term and its uses within paradoxography, in particular, see further Leigh (2013) 161-94. On the use of *ἴδιος*, see Leigh (2013) 187. This description sets Cato's work at the heart of technical advances in agriculture. On agriculture as elite display more generally, see Purcell (1995).
[202] Cato, *Agr*. 2.

managers to account. This recreation of the *lectio* must have recalled Cato's exacting actions as censor, reaffirming the importance of scrupulous attention to this task. The technical agricultural detail of both the *Liber ad filium* and the *De agricultura*, then, affirms Cato's abilities to perform one of his central duties as censor. These works suggest that, even after attaining the censorship, Cato found it necessary to demonstrate his right to the responsibilities of high office. The image of the agriculturalist offered Cato, as a political newcomer who could not rely upon a noble birth, the opportunity to demonstrate his authority as censor through his personal ability and practical skill.

**The *Regimen Morum***

The censors' responsibility for the *regimen morum* was the most significant of their duties. Their guardianship of the *mores* of the Roman people was closely connected to the patrician origins of the office and to its remarkable prestige and authority. Cato also displayed diligence in pursuing this aspect of his censorial duties.[203] The *Liber ad filium* appears to capture something of Cato's role in preserving the morals of the people for future generations.

The didactic nature of the *Liber ad filium* immediately establishes Cato as part of a pattern of cultural transfer, passing on his experiences, knowledge, and values to his son. The work's repeated addresses to the boy, *Marce fili*, make this process particularly vivid.[204] The *Liber ad filium* appears to have offered a prominent place to Licinianus' moral guidance within the

[203] In his *lectio senatus* Cato removed seven men from the senate, including a *consularis*, L. Quinctius Flamininus (Livy 39.42.5-12). His review of the equestian ranks was also harsh; one Lucius Scipio Asiaticus was deprived of his horse (Livy 39.44.1); so too was L. Veturius, who was specifically reprimanded for his failure to care for his own physical health and for neglecting his family cult (*ORF*$^{3}$ XII). Cato's severity during his time in office made a remarkable impression and left a legacy of quarrels with his contemporaries for years to come (Livy 39.44.1-9).
[204] Fs 6, 18.

instruction that it offered and seeks to acquaint him with the activities of 'the good man'. Cato opens his agricultural advice to his son with the pronouncement that 'a good man, Marcus my son, is an experienced husbandman whose tools gleam,' (*vir bonus est, Marce fili, colendi peritus, cuius ferramenta splendent*), commending the value of agricultural labour in producing moral virtue. Similarly, he begins his advice on rhetoric with the declaration that, 'an orator, Marcus my son, is a good man and an experienced speaker,' (*orator est, Marce fili, vir bonus, dicendi peritus*), upholding the importance, in turn, of good moral conduct for public speaking and political activity.[205] These declarations form the heart of the instruction offered to Licinianus in the *Liber ad filium*, grounding the boy's growing technical skills in good moral conduct. Notably, the declarations are also highly reminiscent of those made by Cato in his role as censor; as part of his responsibility for the *regimen morum*, it was Cato himself who defined the *vir bonus* and who could reprimand those individuals who fell below its standard. In particular, the personal conduct of political figures and proper care in the maintenance of property were important concerns for Cato as censor. The moral concerns which Cato expressed in the *Liber* are thus the very same ones which occupied him in his term of office. Significantly, Cato seeks to align the judgements expressed in this work with those of the *maiores*. He does this through the clever use of quotation: in the preface to the *De agricultura*, Cato has the *maiores* confirm the moral value of agricultural work; 'our forefathers... when they honoured a good man, they honoured him in this way: as a good farmer and a good husbandman,' (*maiores nostri... et virum bonum quom laudabant, ita laudabant: bonum agricolam bonumque colonum*).[206] In the *Liber ad filium* Cato repeats the same utterance himself, declaring that the 'skilled farmer' (*colendi peritus*) was a 'good man' (*vir bonus*), thus framing his own personal sentiments as those of the ancestors.[207] Indeed, as Cato admonishes his son with these words in the *Liber ad filium* he depicts himself

[205] Fs 6, 18.
[206] Cato, *Agr. praef.* 2.
[207] F6.

preserving and passing on the values of the *maiores* to the next generation; the phrase encapsulating the moment of transfer within the text itself. This replicates the responsibilty of the censor in the *regimen morum* – preserving and passing on the *mos maiorum* to the next generation of Roman citizens.[208]

Cato has made himself to be a mouthpiece for the *maiores* on a number of other occasions; however, the effect of his claims in the *Liber ad filium* is quite different.[209] This work does not simply show Cato appealing to the precedent of the past, but it actually implicates him within that past, acting as its conduit in the present, and passing on its values into the future. The *Liber ad filium* thus forms a textual monument to Cato's chief responsibility as censor, the *regimen morum*; in capturing the essence of the patrician nature of this office, the *Liber* effectively embeds Cato within the cultural practices of the elite, establishing his place amidst the nobility.

**Conclusion**

The agricultural imagery prominent within Cato's written works, and particularly within the *Liber ad filium*, can be seen to have played an important role within Cato's censorial career. The impression of Cato as a man of ancient moral virtue, practical experience, and technical expertise, aptly embodied in the agriculturalist, helped to affirm Cato's right to hold high office, to defend his actions as censor, and to establish his presence within the patrician

[208] On the possible connection of the responsibilites of the *pater familias* to those of the censor, see above p.190-1.
[209] In his speech *Pro L. Turio contra Gn. Gellium* Cato claims to uphold the views of the ancestors (*atque ego a maioribus memoria sic accepi*); *ORF*[3] 206. Scholars have highlighted the importance of the *maiores* as a political tool for Cato; see, for example, Calboli (1981) 49-50.

element of the Roman elite.[210] Agriculture thus offered Cato significant advantages, granting him access to the traditional authority and antiquity typically denied to him as a political newcomer. Cato's use of this agricultural imagery was not, in itself, novel; indeed, it appears to owe something to the rhetoric of plebeian censors of the previous century. However, Cato's articulation of this imagery in his prose was a new development, and one that allowed him to produce a remarkably coherent image and to return purposefully to it in times of political strife. Much of Cato's agricultural imagery came to be used by the *novi homines* of the subsequent century;[211] and it is likely that his influence still underpins much more modern claims for the virtue of Italian agriculture.[212]

### 3.4 Conclusions

This section has emphasised the importance of the works which Cato addressed to his son as evidence for his life and times. The *Historia*, *Liber ad filium*, and the *Epistulae* have been used to highlight Cato's sustained engagement with contemporary developments in education, his influence over educational policy, and his distinctive stance within the competitive displays of elite in this area. This section has also established the popular appeal of paternal imagery and has explored the possibility that these texts functioned as part of a

[210] Scholars have also sought to see Cato's *Carmen de moribus* as associated with his censorship; in particular, it has been viewed as a direct imitation of the work of the same name by Appius Claudius Caecus (Sciarrino (2011) 199).

[211] Cicero, for example, champions his own rural origins, his capacity for hard work, and his personal virtue as essential prerequisites for a successful magistracy; these are far more important qualifications for election, he argues, than the long family history of magistracies upon which an established member of the Roman nobility could rely. Cicero describes his plight most pointedly at *Verr*. 2.5.180-2. In this passage he even calls upon the example of Cato, amongst other *novi homines*, to construct his own alternative ancestral heritage; see Van der Blom (2010) 158-66.

[212] An early 20th century edition of the *De agricultura*, for example, features the dedication, 'A.S. E. Benito Mussolini Primo Ministro del nuovo regime che risale alle fonti delle virtù latine e le antiche dimenticate vie ritrova per cui ebbe l'Italia forza ed impero'; (Curcio, G. (1929) *La primitiva civiltà latina agricola e il libro dell'agricoltura di M. Porcio Catone*, Florence).

broader paternal image, used strategically within Cato's political career. Finally, it has considered the significance of these works for Cato's censorship, observing that the texts, taken together, implicate the Censor in the practices and behaviours of the nobility which underpinned his prestigious office. Throughout this section I have sought to demonstrate the importance of these fragmentary works for our understanding of Cato's literary, cultural, and political interests. The importance attached to the works that Cato addressed to Licinianus underlies much of the later influence of the image of the Censor as a perfect father and educator.

## 4 The Paternal Legacy

The third and final section of this thesis is an account of the influence of Cato's paternal imagery and educational thought, particularly as expressed in the works which he addressed to Licinianus, on three later works of the Latin didactic tradition. Each of these texts addresses instruction from a father to his son in a piece of prose literature.[1] They form part of an expansive tradition of technical didactic works written in Latin prose which are addressed from father to son and which appear to take Cato's *Liber ad filium* as their precedent in paternal instruction.[2] The discussion offered here thus represents a clear and relatively concise aspect of the reception of Cato the Censor.[3] The narrow scope of this section – focussed upon a small number of works within one strand of later reconstructions of Cato – reflects the thematic approach of this thesis as a whole. This carefully delineated discussion allows us to trace the development of a single, uniquely productive area of Cato's reception, through a sequence of texts which were themselves significant in shaping received impressions of the Censor under the Roman empire, and even into the Mediaeval and Modern ages. The image of Cato as a father and educator, so prominent in the works which he addressed to Licinianus, was of primary importance amongst later readings of the Censor and it certainly merits its specific treatment here. The three texts examined in this section are treated chronologically; looking first at Cicero's *De officiis*, a work whose prominent allusions to the *Liber ad filium* have long been recognised; second, I consider Quintilian's

[1] Quintilian tells us that he had intended to dedicate his work to his son, but was unable to due to his untimely death during the work's composition (*Inst.* 6 *praef.* 1-2, 10).
[2] For an overview of these works, see LeMoine (1991) 343; for those of late antiquity in particular, see Kaster (1988) 67 n.142.
[3] The popularity of Cato the Censor with later authors means that any attempt to discuss his reception needs to be clearly delimited; see, for example, the recent studies of Ceaicovschi (2008), Wulfram (2009). On the difficulties of disentangling received images of the Censor from the actions and behaviours of Cato himself, see above p.4-5.

*Institutio oratoria* and the work's depiction of an ideal education based on the principles of paternal instruction so close to Cato's own construction; third, I examine the *Disticha Catonis*, an anonymous collection of sayings likely compiled in the 1st century AD, which alludes prominently to Cato's relationship with Licinianus and which may derive from his teachings. All three of these texts demonstrate the influence of the *Liber ad filium*, alluding verbally to the work, as well as reproducing its teachings, and drawing upon Cato's educational approach as depicted therein. More widely, these works seek to make use of Cato as a figure full of authority and strongly connected with Roman tradition, in order to lend legitimacy to their own particular didactic projects. The strongly paternal picture of the Censor which these texts promote demonstrates the importance of the role that his relationship with his son played within his life and works and helps to seal the importance of this image within Cato's wider reception.

### 4.1 Cicero

Cicero refers frequently to the figure of Cato the Censor in a variety of guises, citing him *inter alia* as a skilled orator, a historian, an admirable politician, and as a learned man.[4] In particular, Cicero regularly refers to Cato in his capacity as a *novus homo*, calling upon the Censor as an example, and even as a 'spiritual ancestor', as he constructs a political heritage for himself to rival that of his aristocratic peers.[5] Distinct amid these varied recollections of Cato are the appearances which he makes, in a resolutely paternal guise, in three late, philosophical works dated to Cicero's final years. The *De senectute*, *De amicitia*, and the *De*

[4] Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.5; *Brut.* 82; *De or.* 1.171, 2.51ff, 2.142, 3.135; *Tusc.* 1.5, 1.110; *Nat. D.* 2.164.
[5] Cic. *Rep.* 1.1; *Mur.* 17, 66; *Verr.* 2.5.180. On Cicero's idea of a common kinship between all Romans, see *Verr.* 2.5.172; on Cato an early proponent of such a belief, see Blösel (2000). For a general discussion of Cicero's deployment of previous *novi homines*, see Wiseman (1971) 107-10; Van der Blom (2010) 158-66.

*officiis* were all composed in 44 BC.[6] The works exhibit close connections to one another beside their date of composition; *De senectute* and the *De amicitia* were written as companion pieces - both dedicated to Atticus – while the later texts of the trio make reference to the earlier, and all three texts develop shared ideas and ideals.[7] Similarly, these texts offer a vision of Cato the Censor which is remarkably consistent – particularly in comparison to the varied representations of him found in Cicero's earlier works - and which, I believe, should be read as a single, unified construction. Cato is prominently represented in these texts: appearing as a character in the *De senectute*, he is then the subject of discussion in the *De amicitia*, and he provides an important example for the *De officiis*. This prominence focuses upon Cato as a father, and his relationship with Licinianus forms a central part of Cicero's vision of Cato as a teacher and philosopher in these texts. This vision has its own importance for Cicero's promotion of his personal activities – lending Cato's authority and legitimacy to the didactic and philosophical work of Cicero's final years and helping to frame his legacy in these terms.[8] Cicero's life-long interest in Cato finds its culmination in these texts; he must have had to hand an edition of the Censor's writings – including the works addressed to Licinianus - during their rapid composition, an indication of Cato's high-ranking position amongst Cicero's favourite authors and his esteem for him. Cicero's decision to fashion his own final years after this aspect of the Censor reflects not only Cicero's ambitions for his personal legacy, but it also demonstrates the remarkable strength of Cato's paternal image, which Cicero was only too willing to exploit in service of his own future fame.

[6] The *De senectute* was composed in the early months of this year, followed by the *De amicitia* in the spring (Powell (1988) 1-2), while the *De officiis* can be dated to the autumn (Griffin and Atkins (1991) xviii-xix).
[7] Both the *De senectute* and the *De amicitia* were dedicated to Atticus (*Sen*. 2; *Amic*. 2); the *De amicitia* makes reference to the *De senectute* (*Amic*. 4-5, 11); the *De officiis* also makes reference to the *De amicitia* (*Off*. 2.31), and it displays similar sentiments on old age to the *De senectute* (*Off*. 1.123). The *De gloria* also composed during this period, now lost, may have shared in these commonalities. On the unity of Cicero's wider philosophical works of 45-4 BC, see Powell (1995) 7.
[8] Cato the Censor, then, forms a central part of Cicero's 'vigorous justification' of his new activities (Rawson (1975) 231).

**Practical Wisdom and Professional Philosophy**

The *De senectute*, *De amicitia*, and *De officiis* all imagine Cato as a philosopher, and, in particular, as one of a practical nature and popular appeal, an image which Cicero strives to connect closely with his current intellectual activities. The wisdom which the Censor is seen to dispense in these texts is certainly practically oriented. In the opening discussion of the subject found in the *De amicitia* Fannius remarks that Cato was given the title of *sapiens* in his old age (*cognomen iam habebat in senectute sapientis*), on account of his wealth of experience (*quia multarum rerum usum habebat*), and because of the utility of his intelligence to the state (*multa eius et in senatu et in foro vel provisa prudenter vel acta constanter vel responsa acute ferebantur*).[9] Fannius makes a distinction between Cato's wisdom, derived from natural intelligence and practical experience, and the knowledge gained through study. Fannius is eager to differentiate Cato both from L. Acilius, who was described as a *sapiens* on the basis of his legal expertise (*Acilius quia prudens esse in iure civili putabatur*), and from his own father-in-law Laelius, whose wisdom is the result of careful study (*studio et doctrina*) as well as natural inclination (*natura et moribus*).[10] Meanwhile, Cicero's character Cato attributes any wisdom that he has to what he gleaned from the practical example of the aged Fabius Maximus, once more reflecting the importance

[9] Cic. *Amic*. 6; cf. Cic. *Off*. 3.16; *Leg*. 2.5. There is no evidence outside Cicero that Cato was given the title of *sapiens* (Powell (1988) *ad Sen.* 5). However, Cato's *cognomen* has regularly been connected with *catus, -a, -um*, an adjective defined as 'clever, shrewd, prudent, circumspect' (*OLD* 1); Pliny lists *Catus* as a *cognomen* given to the wise (*HN* 7.118); Plutarch records that the *cognomen* was given to Cato as an honorific title (*Cat. Mai*. 1.3); and while Plutarch's account of Cato's name is rather confused (the biographer has his original *cognomen* as Πρῖσκος, which clearly derives from the adjective *priscus, -a, -um*, used to distinguish the Elder and Younger Catos), it is likely that the evidence he provides reflects a popular tradition connecting Cato and *Catus*. The interlocutor of Varro's *Logistoricus*, *Catus: De liberis educandis*, has also been associated with Cato the Censor on similar grounds (see below p.230-1). The adjective was connected with the Sabines; Varro stresses that *catus* actually means 'sharp' or 'keen' rather than 'wise' and he relates that the word is the Sabine variant for *acutus, -a, -um* (Varro, *Ling*. 7.46; Donatus later lists both meanings for *catus*, further connecting the word to the Greek *κάειν* – to kindle (*ad Ter. An*. 855)), a link which makes it all the more tempting to think that Cato sought to exploit a connection between his name and this adjective. Plautus' use of the adjective to describe a wise man in a pseudo-philosophical context at *Pseud*. 678-87 may allude to Cato; this passage has echoes of Catonian language, in its prominent use of the terms *bonus* and *malus*, and the play was produced in 191 BC, around the time of Cato's visit to the cultural centre of Athens.

[10] Cic. *Amic*. 6-7.

of learning through experience, both one's own and others'.[11] Throughout these texts the emphasis which Cicero places on Cato's old age helps to strengthen the impression of the empirical origins of his good sense – Cato's wisdom is seen as deriving from his long experience of life.[12]

As well as being gained through practical means, Cato's wisdom is also felt to have significant practical application. Cato offers valuable advice on how to cope with old age – instruction which is presented as a significant help to his interlocuters within the text.[13] Cato's wisdom is also readily applied in his own life and, unlike Socrates, who is praised for his wise words, it is Cato's deeds which receive widespread acknowledgement, (*huius enim facta, illius dicta laudantur*).[14] This practical application of wisdom is seen above all in Cato's forbearance in the face of the death of his son, whom he lost in the prime of his life, (*quo modo, ut alia omittam, mortem filii tulit! memineram Paulum, videram Galum, sed hi in pueris, Cato in perfecto et spectato viro*). Cato's wisdom, then, is demonstrated ultimately in its practical application; it offers assistance both to himself and to others in times of distress, influencing not only private thought, but also public behaviour. It is also closely connected with the Censor's relationship with Licinianus, a point to which we shall shortly return.

Cato's practical form of wisdom has a notably popular dynamic. In the *De amicitia*, Fannius's description of Laelius as truly wise, not in the judgement of the crowd, but in the

[11] Cic. *Sen*. 12.
[12] Whenever Cicero depicts Cato dispensing wisdom, or being called upon as a source of wisdom, he imagines the Censor as an old man; as such, the *De senectute, De amicitia* and the *De re publica* all depict Cato in this aspect, directly connecting his knowledge to his experience; cf. Plin. *HN* 29.15. However, in his works more generally, Cicero does, in fact, refer frequently to Cato's study and learning; he attributes *doctrina* and *studium* to Cato (*Top*. 78); Cato is described as an expert (*peritissimus*) in civil law (*De or*. 1.171, cf. *De or*. 2.142); and as a man of *diligentia* (*Brut*. 294); Cato is termed *studiosus* (*Tusc*. 1.5); and described as only lacking *politissima doctrina transmarina* (*De or*. 3.135). All descriptions which imply that Cato's wisdom derived, at least in part, from a considerable amount of careful study.
[13] Cic. *Sen*. 4, 6. Cato's advice also provides an immediate practical aid for Atticus, designed by Cicero, outside of the dialogue (*Sen*. 2-3).
[14] Cic. *Amic*. 10.

eyes of educated men, (*nec sicut vulgus, sed ut eruditi solent appellare sapientem*), seems to create an implied contrast with Cato's title of *sapiens,* mentioned just a few lines previously, as an honour bestowed upon him, instead, by the unlearned.[15] Similarly, Cato's advice is cited by Laelius in relation to the ordinary problems of uneducated men: Laelius recalling the Censor's teachings on how to manage such breakdowns of relations as occur in the friendships of the masses (*ad vulgares amicitias*).[16] Cato's teachings are also recollected in the popular form of the proverb, that most basic from of instruction, invoked in terms such as, 'for that saying of Cato is a clever one,' (*scitum est enim illud Catonis*).[17] Cicero thus portrays Cato's wisdom as being popularly acclaimed, broadly applicable, and easily understandable.

This image of Cato as a figure of popular and practical wisdom is also found in Cicero's wider works, where it is frequently contrasted with a negative picture of the impractical irrelevance of professional philosophical study. In the *De oratore,* for example, Cicero contrasts the *sapientia* of great statesmen such as the Catones, Coruncanii, Fabricii, and Scipiones, whose quick intellect and clarity of expression (*cogitandi pronuntiandique rationem vimque dicendi*) gave them great strength of mind (*impetu mentis*) despite the fact that they were not learned (*non tam fortasse docti*), with the *prudentia* of the philosophers Pythagoras, Democritus, Anaxagoras, who, devoted to private study rather than public life (*a regendis civitatibus totos se ad cognitionem rerum transtulerunt*), lived a life of unprofitable seclusion (*quietem atque otium secuti*).[18] The engagement of one's natural wits in service to the state is here preferred to developing one's learning in private study. Cicero adds a further distinction to this traditional contrast in his speech in defence of Murena, given in 62. In this

[15] Cic. *Amic*. 7.
[16] Cic. *Amic*. 76.
[17] Cic. *Amic*. 90.
[18] Cic. *De Or*. 3.56. A similar list of philosophers who engaged in politics is found at Ael. *VH* 3.17.

speech, he constrasts the virtue of the Elder and Younger Catones, both figures of wisdom who engaged in public service, praising the virtue of the Elder Cato as superior to that of the Younger, as it was not hampered by his strict philosophical beliefs.[19] Cicero thus compares the gentle courtesy of the Elder with the resolute strictness of the Younger, encouraging the Younger to 'add a touch of his graciousness and indulgence to your austerity and severity, these qualities – which are of the best kind at present - will not be improved upon, but they will be more pleasantly seasoned,' (*illius comitatem et facilitatem tuae gravitati severitatique asperseris, non ista quidem erunt meliora, quae nunc sunt optima, sed certe condita iucundius*).[20] The serious pursuit of philosophical study is depicted here as detrimental to proper engagement in public life. Cato the Censor is made a champion of wisdom put to practical, public use for the good of the state.

This distinction is also upheld in the vocabulary which Cicero uses to describe Cato across his works. The Censor is never called a *philosophus* or connected with *philosophia*, terms which Cicero reserves for professionals; on occasion Cato is deemed as full of *prudentia*, a term more widely associated with learning;[21] but more regularly, Cicero terms Cato a *sapiens* and associates him with *sapientia*, his most general term for wisdom.[22] Even under this general term, Cicero is nonetheless clear that Cato does not qualify as a *sapiens* in the true sense, stating in the *De officiis* that; 'nor were those men who were regarded and even entitled 'wise', Marcus Cato and Gaius Laelius, wise' (*nec ii qui sapientes habiti et nominati,*

[19] This caricatured opposition between the Elder and Younger Catos continues in Pliny (*HN* 7.113).
[20] Cic. *Mur*. 66. Cicero returns with regularity to this image of the Younger Cato as impractical and irrelevant in his high morality. In a letter to Atticus, Cicero depicts Cato's philosophical idealism as a danger to Roman politics (*Att*. 2.1.8); Cicero also comments upon the political errors that Cato Uticensis made (*Div*. 1.24); he challenges Cato's unwillingness to compromise (*Off*. 3.88); he presents his love of secluded study as perverse (*Fin*. 3.7); and he criticises his whole-hearted subscription to Stoic doctrine (*Fin*. 5.74-6); even describing him as endowed with a 'severity beyond belief' (*incredibilem... gravitatem*); Cic. *Off*. 1.112.
[21] Cic. *Brut*. 293; on the term, see Powell (1995) 4.
[22] Cic. *Amic*. 6, 90; *De or*. 3.56; *Div*. *Caec*. 66; *Leg*. 2.5; *Sen*. 4, 5; *Verr*. 2.2.5. Though on Cicero's careful assimilation of the practical ethics of Roman *sapientia* with Greek philosophical wisdom in the *Tusculan Disputations*, see Gildenhard (2007) 97-107.

*M. Cato et C. Laelius, sapientes fuerunt*), since they do not meet the Stoics' strict criteria for wisdom, 'not one of these men was wise as we understand the word' (*nemo enim horum hic sapiens ut sapientem volumus intellegi*).[23] Similarly, when Cicero terms Cato a *vir bonus*, his use of the term is resolutely not in the strict, Stoic sense, but in a broader, more popular usage.[24] Cicero's descriptions of Cato, then, clearly differentiate his qualities and his wisdom from that of the professional philosophers, and explicitly from those of the serious Stoics.

Indeed, the figure of the Censor may have been involved in constructing these popular categories of strict philosophical concepts. These popular, common-sense ideas were seen to be the product of something termed as *pinguis* or *crassa Minerva*, 'a rough mother-wit'. Laelius explicitly appeals to his own *pinguis Minerva* in formulating his lay-man's definition of the good man, a definition which notably includes Cato; 'let us then go on, as they say, with our own slow wits,' (*agamus igitur pingui, ut aiunt, Minerva*).[25] The phrase has its roots in agricultural language; the adjective *pinguis, -e* is used to describe soil that is 'thick in consistency' and / or 'rich and fertile', whilst it also has the transferred sense of 'slow witted'.[26] Its connections with the native earth naturally suggest a link to the expertise of Rome's most revered agricultural writer. Moreover, the phrase's connection to the land forms a natural opposition to the learning sourced from beyond the sea which Cicero and his contemporaries felt that Cato lacked; 'for what did Marcus Cato lack but this refined and rarified discipline imported from overseas? (*quid enim M. Catoni praeter hanc politissimam doctrinam transmarinam atque adventitiam defuit?*).[27] This contrast strongly suggests that

[23] Cic. *Off*. 3.16.
[24] Cic. *Amic*. 18-21.
[25] Cic. *Amic*. 19.
[26] *OLD* 6b, 3b, 7. *crassus, -a, -um*, is used similarly to describe soil that is 'heavy' or 'thick-set' (4b), as well as in the transferred sense of 'coarse', 'rough', or 'homely' thought or writing (7), although it lacks the positive sense of fertility found in some uses of *pinguis*.
[27] Cic. *De or*. 3.135; cf. Nep. *Att*. 17.3, where *doctrina* refers to philosophy. The quality is discussed further by Cicero (*Rep*. 3.5); where he distinguishes between Greek, philosophical doctrine associated with Socrates and achieved by secluded study (*hanc a Socrate adventiciam doctrinam*), and the general wisdom of the ancestors

Cato's wisdom, like the Censor himself, fell firmly within the realm of popular wisdom represented by *crassa Minerva*. Horace also appears to exploit the connection of this kind of wisdom with Cato, using the phrase to describe the teaching of a remarkably Catonian figure, 'Ofellus, a peasant, philosopher no particular school and of rough, homegrown wit,' (*Ofellus / rusticus, abnormis sapiens crassaque Minerva*).[28] Horace's Ofellus is a farm-worker and a *rusticus* who recognises the importance of frugality,[29] and disapproves of the luxurious tastes of young Romans.[30] These are all traits shared by the Censor. Ofellus' name, a derivative of the Latin *ofella, -ae* - 'a small piece of meat, cutlet' even forms the final subject for instruction in the *De agricultura*.[31] In the character of Ofellus, then, Horace continues Cato's teachings and ideas, closely connecting them with the form of intelligence known as *crassa Minerva*. For both Cicero and Horace, then, this idea expressed homely wisdom reaped from Rome's native earth, as opposed to knowledge imported from schools overseas, and which was strongly associated, in this opposition, with the figure of Cato the Censor.[32] Cato thus seems to have been instrumental in definitions of popular and practical philosophy.

Cicero's vision of Cato the Censor in the *De senectute*, *De amicitia*, and the *De officiis*, then, is a figure full of practical wisdom, which has popular appeal, is widely applicable, and which is explicitly non-professional. Many elements of this vision are not new; we have seen Cicero call upon the image of Cato the Censor to oppose the seclusion of study and the strictness of professional philosophy elsewhere in his works,[33] and the opposition between practical good sense and philosophical wisdom has a long history as popular criticism

learnt through experience (*domesticum maiorumque morem*). For further discussion, see Marmorale (1949) 148-50; Della Corte (1969) 196-7; Garbarino (1973) 321-3.

[28] Hor. *Sat*. 2.2.3.

[29] Hor. *Sat*. 2.2.66-8 is particularly reminiscent of Cato, *Agr*. 2.7.

[30] Hor. *Sat*. 2.2.52.

[31] See *OLD* s.v. *ofella, -ae* with Cato, *Agr*. 162.1.

[32] Otto (1890) 224-5. However, the phrase is used more negatively in later sources; Columella has it mean 'those who are very stupid' (*Rust*. 1 *praef*. 33) and Macrobius uses the phrase to describe a reader who does not undertand the meaning of a poem (*Sat*. 1.24.13).

[33] Such images can be traced back to the rhetoric of the Censor himself; see above p.152-3, 171-2.

levelled against professional schools of thought. However, the vision of Cato offered in these three texts is novel in the singularly practical picture of populist Cato which it presents, in the claims which it makes for his practical wisdom as philosophy, and in the close connections which this vision has to Cicero's own occupations at this time. The significance of Cato's relationship with his son in developing these points is remarkable.

The depiction in these texts of Cato as an unstudied figure of pure practicality documented above is, as has been noted, remarkably different from the impression of him created across the rest of Cicero's works. Yet Cato is simultaneously presented here as the truest philosopher and his teachings as true philosophy.[34] In the *De amicitia*, Laelius claims that if any man is to be termed wise, Cato should be, (*si quisquam, ille sapiens fuit*).[35] He even warns Scaevola against ranking the wisdom of Socrates more highly than that of Cato.[36] Further to this, the wisdom which Cato offers in the *De senectute* is presented as the best form of philosophy, with Cicero listing this text prominently amongst his philosophical works, on account of the practical strength and comfort which it offers, (*in primisque quoniam philosophia vir bonus efficitur et fortis, 'Cato' noster in horum librorum numero ponendus est.*).[37] In these texts, Cicero thus makes Cato's paternal experiences, particularly those of loss and grief, to be the focus of his wisdom, and Cicero presents that wisdom as the purest form of philosophy.

Indeed, this vision of philosophy as a comfort to those who suffer, endowing them with the strength to continue in their difficult situations, is a precise reflection of Cicero's own

[34] This is in marked distinction from earlier claims that common sense wisdom formed an excellent alternative to philosophy - here this wisdom is presented as philosophy, and even as the very best form of philosophy.
[35] Cic. *Amic*. 9.
[36] Cic. *Amic*. 10.
[37] Cic. *Div*. 2.3. Modern critics typically term this as the least properly philosophical of Cicero's works; see Powell (1988) 12-6.

circumstances, as he sought to derive personal consolation from his philosophical writings.[38] The Catonian precedent for his activities lends Cicero's works greater legitimacy as a suitable occupation for a Roman statesman, connecting these late philosophical texts to a tradition of authority and antiquity.[39] Yet more than simply lending legitimacy to Cicero's current personal activities, this construction of philosophy as a doctrine with its roots in Rome's greatest statesman, Cato the Censor, secures its importance for the statesmen of Rome's future, an importance that had already begun to wax large, as the significance of political oratory waned under Caesar's dictatorship.[40] The figure of Cato guarantees the importance of philosophy: Cicero's works make us aware that he was Rome's first philosopher, just as he was Rome's first orator, and that it is now the time for Cato's beginnings in philosophy to reach their full expression in Cicero, just as his beginnings in oratory had done.[41]

Furthermore, the didactic patterns of these texts identify Cicero as the modern representative of Cato's true philosophical wisdom. The works carefully construct a genealogy which connects Cicero's writings back to the original words of the Censor: in 150 Cato the Elder instructs the young Scipio Aemilianus and Gaius Laelius on old age; sometime after 129, Laelius tells his sons-in-law Scaevola Augur and C. Fannius about his friendship with Scipio

[38] The loss of his daughter, Tullia, in early 45, in addition to his political disillusionment, compounded Cicero's griefs at this time.

[39] Cf. Gildenhard (2007) 22-3, 30-1, 50-1 (on Cicero's general use of Cato's authority within his philosophical works), and 112-8, 134-7 (on Cicero's clever reworking of the Catonian didactic programme particularly in support of philosophy at the start of the *Tusculan Disputations*).

[40] Cicero carefully represents his present philosophical studies as the most appropriate equivalent possible for his former political activities under the current circumstances (*Div*. 2.7; *Tusc*. 1.6, 2.1; Gildenhard (2007) 148-56). In the *Tusculan Disputations*, particularly, he emphasises that the 'historical moment' for philosophy has now arrived in Rome; Caesar's dictatorship has not only made oratory impossible, but it has also marked the failure of Rome's former, non-philosophical, educational structures and has highlighted the fact that educational reform is now immediately necessary for there to be any hope of a return to Rome's past republican glory (*Leg*. 3.29; *Div*. 2.5; *Tusc*. 1.6-7; Rawson (1975) 230-47; Gildenhard (2007) 74-6, 112-8). Although philosophy has, for Cicero, always been important for good oratory (*inter alia Inv. rhet*. 1.1; *Part. or*. 70, 140; *De or*. 1.83, 3.56, 3.65, 3.80; *Leg*. 1.63), it is only at this moment that the two arts are fully reconciled, and that philosophy takes on its full significance for him.

[41] Seneca, too, constructs the republican past as a period of proto-philosophy, with some rudimentary advances made in the discipline during these years that the modern age – with its preoccupation with vice rather than virtue – was at risk of forgetting; see Costa (2013) 136-9.

Aemilianus; then in the 90s Cicero was a student of Scaevola Augur, who – we assume - told Cicero about his dialogue with Laelius and about Laelius' dialogue with Cato; finally in the 40s Cicero writes the *De senectute* and the *De amicitia*, direct continuations of the Censor's wisdom.[42] This narrative lends Cicero's writings the credibility of eye witness statements and gives his teachings the authority of ages past. This genealogy also allows Cicero to present himself as Cato's true heir. This idea is pertinent in Cicero's remark to Cato the Younger that his great-grandfather is 'an example set forth for me to imitate, as much as for you,' (*ad imitandum vero tam mihi propositum exemplar illud est quam tibi*), suggesting that Cicero, too, can style himself after the Censor.[43] Cicero's late philosophical works depict Cato as wise for his age and times, noting that there was no one wiser (*nemo prudentior*) at that time (*temporibus illis*);[44] in so doing, they imply that a new representative of his wisdom needs to be found for the modern age, a role naturally taken on by Cicero himself. In the *De officiis* Cicero goes a step further than this: fully integrating himself into the genealogy of philosophy that he has constructed by pesonally projecting it forward into future generations and offering philosophical instruction to his son.[45] As we shall see below, this instruction is fashioned under the influence of Cato's education of Licinianus – Cicero framing his legacy after that of the Censor.

**Philosophical Teaching**

[42] Van der Blom, H 'Ciceronian Reconstructions of the Oratorical Past', paper given to the *Oxford Philological Society*, 8/11/2013; cf. Steel (2005) 108.
[43] Cic. *Mur*. 66.
[44] Cic. *Amic*. 5.
[45] On this interest in the next generation as typically Roman and specifically Catonian, see Gildenhard (2007) 31 n.111 with bibliography given there.

The philosophical wisdom which Cicero attributes to Cato explicitly in the *De senectute* and the *De amicitia,* and implicitly in the *De officiis,* is of a distinctly Stoic dynamic.[46] These Stoic affinities form another part of Cicero's philosophical portrait of Cato that is closely connected to the Censor's relationship with his son and to the works which he addressed to him. In the *De senectute,* Cicero is careful to frame Cato's wisdom in Stoic terms. Cicero has Cato appeal prominently, in accordance with Stoic belief, to nature as his 'best guide' for a life well lived (*naturam, optimam ducem*), at the very beginning of his excursus on old age.[47] A little later in the work, Cato frames his instruction as an essential duty of the elderly, who as yet have sufficient strength to, 'teach and train young men, equipping them for every task of their duty', (*adulescentes doceat, instituat, ad omne offici munus instruat*), making use of the terms *munus* and *officium*, both words prominent within the Stoic vocabulary.[48] Cato even heralds this teaching as the noblest of works (*quo quidem opere quid potest esse praeclarius?*), acceding the highest place to Stoic doctrine.[49] The prominent position of these terms clearly displays Cato's Stoic affinities in this text.

The instruction which Cicero's Cato gives on agriculture, his subject of special expertise, in the work is also coloured with Stoic thought. Cato begins his excursus on agriculture by describing it as the perfect activity for the philosopher: 'it seems to me to be in the closest accord with the life of the wise man' (*mihi ad sapientis vitam proxime videntur accedere*).[50] Some while later, Cato adds the example of Laertes to reinforce this statement, noting that Homer represented the old man as finding comfort in agricultural labour – just as one might in philosophy – during Odysseus' absence (*lenientem desiderium quod capiebat e filio,*

[46] On the affinities of Stoicism to Roman thought, and to Cicero's thought particularly, see Powell (1995) 23-6.
[47] Cic. *Sen*. 5. Cicero praises this ideal as the best of Stoic belief elsewhere (*Off*. 3.13).
[48] Cic. *Sen*. 29.
[49] Cic. *Sen*. 29.
[50] Cic. *Sen*. 51. The idea that the life of a farmer is near to the perfect wise man's life appears to be 'peculiar to Cicero, and would seem paradoxical to most Greek philosophers,' (Powell (1988) *ad loc*.).

*colentem agrum et stercorantem facit*).[51] In particular, Cato's description of plant growth, from sowing (*gremio mollito ac subacto sparsum semen excepit*), germination (*tepefactum vapore et compressu suo diffundit et elicit herbescentem ex eo viriditatem*), and growth (*nixa fibris stirpium sensim adolescit, culmoque erecta geniculato vaginis iam quasi pubescens includitur*), through to maturation (*ex quibus cum emersit, fundit frugem spici ordine exstructam, et contra avium minorum morsus munitur vallo aristarum*), has echoes of the Stoic scientific thought found in descriptions of the process in the *De Natura Deorum* and the *Tusculan Disputations*.[52] Cicero interweaves this philosophical vision of agricultural activity with ideas that recall Cato's own life and works.[53] The discussion here includes viticulture, grafting, and irrigation, all topics which Cato treated in the *De agricultura*; Cicero's Cato even mentions his work directly, in a discussion about fertiliser, asking, 'why talk about the usefulness of muck-spreading? I spoke on this in the book which I wrote on agriculture.' (*quid de utilitate loquar stercorandi? dixi in eo libro quem de rebus rusticis scripsi*).[54] The philosophical worth which Cicero's Cato attributes to agriculture also finds precedent, of sorts, in the preface to the *De agricultura*, which praises farmers as the most honest of professions, (*minimeque male cogitantes sunt qui in eo studio occupati sunt*).[55] In addition, Cicero's character of Cato exhibits further similarities to the historical figure in drawing on Xenophon, an author that the Censor knew well;[56] mentioning Dentatus, an influence on his life;[57] and repeating the Censor's own appreciation for well-cultivated land.[58] The *De senectute*, then, goes to significant lengths to relate the Stoic teachings, in which its character

[51] Cic. *Sen*. 54.
[52] Cic. *Sen*. 51; cf. *Tusc*. 5.36; *Nat. D*. 2 *passim*; see also Powell (1988) *ad loc*.
[53] In the *De officiis*, Cicero equates philosophy and farming in a slightly different way, using agriculture as an analogy for philosophical study; paralleling the subject to a field, Cicero describes philosophy as fruitful and productive (*frugifera et fructuosa*), noting that while the whole doctrine deserves cultivation (*nec ulla pars eius inculta ac diserta sit*) study in one's duties offers the richest rewards (*nullus feracior... locus est nec uberior*); Cic. *Off*. 3.5.
[54] Cic. *Sen*. 54. Pliny also cites Cato as an expert on the subject (*HN* 18.174).
[55] Cato, *Agr*. *praef*. 4.
[56] Cic. *Sen*. 59; for a discussion of Cato and Xenophon, see above p.32 n.98.
[57] Cic. *Sen*. 55; for a discussion of Cato and Dentatus, see above p.196-7.
[58] Cic. *Sen*. 57; for a discussion of Cato's concern for proper cultivation, see above p.198-9.

of Cato instructs the dialogue's younger participants, to the life and activites of the historical Cato in a credible way.[59]

Cicero also depicts Cato's attitude in the face of his son's death as one of remarkable forbearance.[60] In the *De senectute*, the Censor takes consolation for Licinianus' death in his philosophical beliefs, rejoicing that their separation will not be a long one, (*me ipse consolabar exstimans non longinquum inter nos digressum et discessum fore*).[61] These beliefs appear to be of a popular nature, expressing typically vague notions of an afterlife which is characterised by an awareness of one's earthly life, including a reunion with loved ones.[62] These beliefs, Cato claims, have given him the appearance of great emotional strength, (*ego meum casum fortiter ferre visus sum*);[63] upon which Laelius duly remarks in the *De amicitia*, praising the manner in which Cato bore the loss (*quo modo... mortem fili tulit!*), even though the tragedy struck in the prime of Licinianus' life (*in perfecto et spectato viro*), before concluding that such forbearance qualified Cato alone to be deemed wise (*si quisquam ille sapiens fuit*), and saw his wisdom to be ranked alongside that of Socrates (*quam ob rem cave Catoni anteponas ne istum, quidem ipsum quem Apollo, ut ais, spientissimum iudicavit*).[64] These lines ascribe to Cato a forbearance that was a feature of popular ideas of Stoicism. This popular idea of Stoicism is combined with the more professional account of the school, found in the technical terminology and scientific descriptions which are attributed to Cato in these texts. The Stoic associations which Cicero gives to Cato thus span a whole specturm of

[59] Further effort is made by Cicero in his opening address to Atticus, in which he reminds his friend that Cato's later years were rich in the scholarship of Greek literature (*Sen*. 3).
[60] Cicero also mentions this at *Fam*. 4.6.1 and *Tusc*. 3.70 (a passage which strongly suggests that Cato also featured in Cicero's *Consolatio*).
[61] Cic. *Sen*. 84.
[62] They find parallels in Cicero's *Pro Archia*, a work resolutely committed to assimilating foreign ideas to familiar patterns of thought, which guarantee this popular aspect; see Cic. *Arch*. 29-30 with Berry (2000) 107-21, (2004) 291-312.
[63] Cic. *Sen*. 84.
[64] Cic. *Amic*. 9-10.

philosophical understanding; yet all are carefully connected to the Censor's life and works, and, most notably, to his relationship with Licinianus.

Cicero follows this picture of Catonian Stoicism with a series of allusions, found in prominent positions across the *De officiis*, which connect this work with Cato's *Liber ad filium*. The *De officiis*, a work of instruction addressed by Cicero to his son, was based primarily upon the Stoic philosopher Panaetius' lost *Περὶ τοῦ Καθήκοντος*,[65] and so the connection that these allusions make to Cato appears to have offered Cicero a valuable Roman colour – one which he had sought to assimilate to Stoic philosophical thought - for his final didactic project.

Cicero most clearly connects his *De officiis* with Cato's *Liber ad filium* through the works' shared addressee.[66] Cicero addresses his son with the appellation 'Marcus, my son' (*Marce fili*) at several prominent points within the text. This address is an exact verbal repetition of Cato's words to Licinianus, 'Marcus my son', found in several significant fragments of the *Liber ad filium*.[67] Cicero uses this address at the opening of each of the three books of the *De officiis*, as well as in its final lines, positions of strategic importance within the structure of the work. He also repeats this address at two other points in book one: as Cicero addresses Marcus on moral goodness (*formam quidem ipsam, Marce fili, et tamquam faciem honesti vides*) and as he exhorts him to emulate his father's achievements (*licet enim mihi, M. fili, apud te gloriari, ad quem et hereditas huius gloriae et factorum imitatio pertinet*), both topics which are central to the aims and concerns of the work.[68] At all other points in the text,

[65] Cic. *Off*. 2.60, 3.7.
[66] Several scholars have noted the verbal similarities of this shared address as the focus of a connection between the two works. See Süss (1965) 144-5; LeMoine (1991); Cugusi (1994) 80; Dyck (1996) 11; Suerbaum and Blänsdorf (2002) 410; Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001) *ad loc*.
[67] F6, 18; on the significance of the addressee within the work, see above p.55-6, 122-4, 130-1.
[68] *Off*. 1.15, 1.78.

Marcus is addressed either as 'my dear Cicero' (*mi Cicero*) or simply with the second person pronoun.[69] It is clear, therefore, that Cicero's use of this particular appellation is not simply for variety. Cicero deliberately alludes to Cato's *Liber ad filium* at prominent points within the *De officiis,* framing his own work as following in the Censor's tradition of didactic instruction and strongly suggesting that Cicero wished to create an impression of similarity between the two texts.[70]

The lack of evidence for the form and content of the *Liber ad filium* makes it difficult to comment upon the broader similarities between these works. However, it is possible to observe that both texts exhibit many features associated with oral delivery; as noted above, both make use of the vocative and the second person pronoun to call upon their addressees; while Cicero also imagines his son hearing his voice through the papyrus rolls (*his voluminibus ad te profecta vox est mea*),[71] makes immediate demands from his son, (*ego a te postulo, mi Cicero...*) and even sets out conditions should his wishes go unfulfilled (*sin hoc non licet...*), all utterances which invoke Marcus' immediate presence, calling upon his ability to reply.[72] In the case of Cicero's work, these verbal elements are to be connected to the epistolary nature of the treatise – the work was addressed to Marcus whilst he studied abroad in Athens.[73] While it has been argued above that the verbal elements of Cato's work derive from its original, oral delivery, the *Liber* has been read as a letter and has frequently been connected with the epistolary form.[74] Regardless of the origins of the verbal elements which we find in these works, their effects on both works is similar – creating a shared sense of

[69] For *mi Cicero,* see *Off.* 2.8, 2.44, 3.5, 3.33; *tu* is common througout, but see especially *Off.* 2.44-6.
[70] It appears that Cicero's description of his decision to address the work to his son is only pseudo-casual; 'I'll address this to Cicero my son; he seems a likely target' (*προσφωνῶ autem Ciceroni filio; visum est non ἀνοίκειον*); *Att.*16.11.4.
[71] Cic. *Off.* 3.121.
[72] Cic. *Off.* 3.33.
[73] Cic. *Off.* 1.1; although it was always intended for a general audience (*Off.* 2.45). On the strong epistolary connections of the work, see Morello and Morrison (2007) 9-13.
[74] See above p.122-4, 130-1.

informality and a conversational tone. In the case of Cicero, this may be an effect that he decided to pursue directly in imitation of Cato.

Further to this, the *De officiis* is closely connected with *praecepta* as a form for delivering instruction. At the start of the work, Cicero heralds the precepts which have been handed down on duties as the most broadly applicable form of philosophy (*latissime patere videntur ea, quae de officiis tradita ab illis et praecepta sunt*).[75] At its conclusion, he urges his son to take pleasure in these precepts, (*talibus monitis praeceptisque laetabere*).[76] This presentation of his philosophy in the form of traditional sayings reflects the Latin vocabulary used more widely for the discussion of Stoic ethics.[77] Yet this presentation may also seek to identify Stoic teaching with traditional Roman paternal wisdom in general, and with Cato the Censor in particular. The *Liber ad filium* has broad associations with the *paterna praecepta*, sharing similar content and style, and has been described as a collection of *praecepta*.[78] Styling his philosophy after ancient paternal wisdom thus allows Cicero to present his foreign doctrines as akin to authoritative and authentic Roman teachings – an association with Cato would only strengthen this impression.[79]

[75] Cic. *Off*. 1.4.
[76] Cic. *Off*. 3.121.
[77] Brutus' work *On Duties - Περὶ Καθήκοντα* was described by Seneca as yielding 'many sayings for parents and children and brothers,' (*multa praecepta et parentibus et liberis et fratribus*); Sen. *Ep*. 95.45.
[78] See above p.97-8, 157-9, 169.
[79] Seneca (*Ep*. 95.45) and Priscian (*Inst*. 6. p.7l l.8-9 K.) highlight the familial, and particularly the paternal nature of the advice offered in Brutus' *On Duties*; while a comparable effect may be found in Lucretius, who presents Epicurus as a wise father figure, rather than as a philosopher, at strategic points in his *De Rerum Natura*. In the proem to book three of the work, for example, Lucretius describes Epicurus' teachings as *patria praecepta*, assimilating them to these traditional Roman forms of wisdom (Lucr. 3.9-10).

Cicero's *De officiis* recommends for his son a range of professions which are also the subjects of Cato's advice to Licinianus in the *Liber ad filium*.[80] This certainly reflects the longstanding importance of these occupations for Roman citizens, and, it may also reflect a deliberate attempt, particularly in the order and organisation of the treatment of these professions, to imitate the advice of the Censor. Cicero claims, just as Cato had done before him, that no pursuit is superior to farming, 'no occupation is better than agriculture, none more profitable or more pleasant, none more worthy of a free man,' (*nihil est agri cultura melius, nihil uberius nihil dulcius, nihil homine [nihil] libero dignius*).[81] An opinion which he connects with the views expressed by his character Cato in the *De senectute* (*de qua... in Catone Maiore satis multa diximus*) and which is a clear echo of the historical Cato's praise for the superlative nature of the occupation found in the opening of the *De agricultura* and again in the *Liber ad filium*.[82] Further to this, Cicero emphasises the importance of *eloquentia* in service to other citizens and to the state; in particular, he notes the high place that the skill held in the opinion of the ancestors, (*huic [quoque] ergo a maioribus nostris est in toga dignitatis principatus datus*).[83] He also emphasises the value of legal expertise in a similar manner, noting that 'the study and interpretation of our well-constituted civil law was always held in the highest regard' (*tum quod optime constituti iuris civilis summo semper in honore fuit cognitio atque interpretatio*) among the 'honourable pursuits of the ancestors' (*multa praeclara maiorum*).[84] These professions, presented as part of the range of career options available to young Cicero, were well established pursuits for citizens of a certain class. They

[80] Cicero notes that a youth's choice of career is the most difficult of decisions, presenting his work as a piece of valuable parental advice to help him make this choice, akin to the divine guidence given to Hercules (*Off.* 1.117-8).
[81] Cic. *Off.* 1.151.
[82] Cato, *Agr. praef.* 4; F6.
[83] Cic. *Off.* 2.66.
[84] Cic. *Off.* 2.65.

also represent topics on which we know Cato advised Licinianus, and so Cicero may well be deliberately drawing upon a connection with the Censor here.[85]

The figure of the Censor also features more widely in *De officiis*; Cicero recalls Cato's writings and sayings, his actions, policies and opinions, drawing upon the Censor with remarkable frequency across all three books of the work. Cicero calls upon one of Cato's letters to Licinianus as an example in his discussion of a just war; indeed, this incident forms the first positive example taken from Roman history that we find in the work.[86] He also cites prominently from Cato's *Origines* at the very start of book three of the work, quoting Cato's remark upon the *otium* of Scipio Africanus.[87] Both citations display carefully Cato's learning and philosophical wisdom. Cicero also calls upon Cato as an excellent statesman, with Cicero citing his declaration of war on Carthage as a demonstration of civil power and even supporting Cato's desire to wipe out the city.[88] More generally, Cicero cites Cato on the importance of *fides*,[89] and he appears to share the Censor's views on avarice,[90] modesty,[91] and the importance of personal restraint in gathering popular support.[92] The variety of references to Cato's life and literary works within the *De officiis* suggests that Cicero sought to make the Censor something of a touchstone for this text: Cicero cites from Cato's works at strategic points, uses his policies as examples, and holds his opinions as essential Roman values.[93] The works which Cato addressed to Licinianus figure prominently in these

[85] On oratory: Fs 18-21; on law: F22.
[86] Cic. *Off*. 1.37.
[87] Cic. *Off*. 3.1 = F130b *FRHist*.
[88] Cic. *Off*. 1.79, 1.35.
[89] Cic. *Off*. 3.104.
[90] Cic. *Off*. 2.77; cf. *Carmen de moribus* F1.
[91] Cic. *Off*. 1.129; cf. Plut. *Cat*. *Mai*. 20.7-8.
[92] Cic. *Off*. 2.77; cf. *ORF*$^{3}$ 174.
[93] On Cicero's assimilation of Cato's policies and opinions into a cultural consensus as part of his idealised vision of the 2nd century BC, see below p.231-3.

references and it seems probable that Cicero had an edition of Cato, which included these works within it, to hand at the time of writing.[94]

Cicero clearly frames his *De officiis* as a work of paternal instruction in the tradition of Cato's *Liber ad filium*. The prominent allusions which we find to the *Liber* in particular, and to Cato in general, represent Cicero's efforts to connect his writings with the Censor's authority and antiquity, aligning his foreign philosophical doctrine with the patterns of traditional, paternal education as articulated by Cato.[95] In the *Liber ad filium*, then, Cicero draws upon Cato at his most Stoic moment. The instruction offered to Licinianus on the qualities and attributes of the *vir bonus* as part of the duties of the *pater familias* can readily be connected with Stoic discussions of *munus* and *officia*.[96] This construction of the *Liber ad filium* as a para-philosophical treatise complements the philosophical vision of Cato found elsewhere in Cicero's works, in which the Censor exhibits a Stoicism – one coloured by both professional and popular elements - that is rooted in his relationship with his son. Evidence from other writers of the 1st century BC suggests that Cicero was not alone in his attempts to portray Greek philosophical doctrine as Roman *paterna praecepta*; however, his use of Cato the Censor and the works which he addressed to his son, upon whom this portrayal hinges, was quite unique.

[94] It has been observed that the rapid rate of Cicero's composition of the *De officiis* means that he must have followed his sources closely, supplementing Panaetius' text 'from materials that he had readily to hand, including political commentary such as always flowed freely from his pen... anecdotes or examples he had stored away in his memory... or materials he had worked up in preparing other works,' (Dyck (1996) 19).

[95] Cicero himself comments upon his combination of Greek and Latin throughout his studies (*semper cum Graecis Latina coniunxi*); *Off.* 1.1. See also Garbarino (1973) 380-412.

[96] Horace also suggests that he found in the *Liber ad filium* a work of content akin to Stoic philosophical thought, citing one of the text's most famous teachings, *rem tene, verba sequentur* (F19), which he reworks as part of the instruction offered to poets (*scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons. / rem tibi Socraticae poterunt ostendere chartae, / uerbaque prouisam rem non inuita sequentur*), in order that they might understand the tasks (*munus et officium*) of their role (Hor. *Ars P.* 306-11). Again we see Cato's work used to discuss Stoic teaching – in this case with Horace reapplying Cato's underlying principles of rhetoric to the use of philosophy in the composition of poetry.

**An Educational Expert**

In addition to his expertise as a philosopher and his affinities with Stoic thought, Cicero also develops in his Cato remarkable didactic skills. Cicero most vividly pictures the Censor in this attitude in the *De senectute*, which depicts Cato not only as extolling the importance of didactic activity for sustaining old age, but also captures him directly engaged in this very activity, as he instructs Scipio and Laelius through the dialogue. This impression of Cato was not unique to the *De senectute*: Cicero also drew upon the idea of Cato as an inspired teacher in the *De re publica*, it was important for both Varro and Seneca, and may well have been used by later Roman writers more widely. This impression of Cato as a gifted teacher and trainer of young men must derive from the role which he had in Licinianus' education and suggests, once more, that this relationship was a significant part of Cato's public persona and political life, as well as an important element of his reception in Cicero.

Cicero has his character Cato articulate a noble vision of the vocation of teaching in section twenty nine of his *De senectute*. Cato praises the occupation as the highest calling for a retired statesman, asking what task could possibly be more glorious (*quo quidem opere quid potest esse praeclarius?*). The Censor recalls the didactic activities of his own elders, Gnaeus and Publius Scipio and Lucius Aemilius and Publius Africanus, with admiration, describing them as 'blessed' (*fortunati*) in the 'crowd of noble youths' (*comitatu nobilium iuvenum*) that was seen to surround them. Further to this, he remarks on the gladness that these attendant youths bring to old age, wondering what could be more pleasant (*quid enim est iucundius senectute stipata studiis iuventutis?*). Cato even claims that, in spite of their failing strength (*quamvis consenuerint vires atque defecerint*), all those who offer instruction in this manner should be considered happy (*nec ulli bonarum artium magistri non beati putandi*). Yet this

instruction offers benefits for the pupils, too, as the old man teaches them all the skills they will need to succeed in public life (*doceat, instituat, ad omne offici munus instruat*).[97] This description of teaching establishes the occupation not only as the activity of old age *par excellence*, but also as an occupation with an authoritative precedent, with great importance for the upholding of the Republic, and hence with enormous prestige. This picture lends significance to teaching at several levels: to the character of Cato within the *De senectute*, to the treatise itself as a didactic device, and, more broadly, to Cicero's own didactic activities during his final years.[98]

Cicero also depicts his character Cato in the act of teaching itself. This depiction owes much to the impression of paternal, practical, and pragmatic instruction found in the Censor's educational writings. The instruction which Cato gives in the *De senectute*, then, is informally and orally delivered, given in response to Laelius' request that Cato teach himself and Scipio with what 'guiding principles' (*rationibus*) they would best be able 'to bear their increasingly burdensome age' (*ingravescentem aetatem ferre*).[99] The instruction which Cato gives is derived from his own practical experiences. Scipio himself remarks that he often marvels (*saepe numero admirari soleo*) at the way in which his interlocutor is never burdened by his old age (*numquam tibi senectutem gravem esse*), clearly demonstrating that it was Cato's lived experience upon which he drew in these particular teachings.[100] Cato's excursus on agriculture as an ideal occupation for old age is also taken from his personal experience in

[97] Later in the treatise, Cato remarks upon the importance of education for forming a worthy character for life (*Sen*. 65).
[98] Cicero tells us that he was involved in the instruction of less experienced orators (*Fam*. 9.16.7, 9.18, 9.20.3), apparently offering classes in declamation (*Tusc*. 1.7), and allowing his speeches to be studied by young admirers (*Att*. 2.1.3). We also know that Cicero was also involved in the instruction of his son and his nephew, and the *Partitiones Oratoriae* and *De officiis*, both dedicated to Cicero junior, provide evidence for this; see above p.173 n.104.
[99] Cic. *Sen*. 6.
[100] Cic. *Sen*. 4.

land-managment.[101] Similarly, Cato expects his interlocutors to put his instruction into practice; he hopes that Scipio and Laelius will reach old age and will 'be able to make a trial by experience of all that you have heard from me,' (*ea, quae ex me audistis, re experti probare possitis!*).[102] The instruction which Cato gives, the manner in which it was delivered, and the application of his teaching, then, are all overwhelmingly practical – an emphasis which reflects the Censor's own didactic writings.

A similar picture of Cato's teaching is found in the *De re publica*, a work written by Cicero about six to ten years prior to this one.[103] At the opening of the second book of the work, Scipio describes his education under Cato's guidance.[104] Once more, we find Cato's teachings sourced in his personal experience of public life, both as a politician (*tantus erat in homine usus rei publicae*), and as an orator (*modus in dicendo*), in times of peace and war (*domi et militiae*), and over long years (*diutissime*).[105] Where these teachings are more theoretical - Scipio cites Cato, for example, on the constitutions of different Mediterranean city states - they are nonetheless clearly of relevance to the raising of a good Roman statesman.[106] This practically-oriented instruction is delivered in a pragmatic manner; Scipio describes Cato's teaching as administered over an extended period of time (*me totum ab adulescentia dedidi*) and as gleaned largely through conversation (*cuius me numquam satiare potuit oratio*).[107] This practical and pragmatically delivered instruction was all derived from a

[101] Cic. *Sen*. 51-8.
[102] Cic. *Sen*. 85.
[103] On the time of beginning the work, see Cic. *Q Fr*. 2.12.1, 3.5.1-2; on its final circulation and reception, see Cic. *Att*. 5.12.2; *Fam*. 8.1.4.
[104] Cicero also describes Aemilianus as a *discipulus* of Cato's at *Inv. rhet*. 1.5.
[105] Cic. *Rep*. 2.1.
[106] Cic. *Rep*. 2.2; Scipio's citation here is generally attributed to the *Origines* (F5 Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi (2001); F131 *FRHist*.). It may be worth comparing this discussion of different constitutions to Plutarch's description of Cato urging the youth of Rome to heed to their laws and magistrates, rather than becoming fixated by Greek philosophy (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 22.7); it could well be discussions such as this one that Cato saw as included within the study of Roman law, making it a valuable alternative to the philosophical dialogue characteristic of the latter stages of Hellenistic educational systems.
[107] Cic. *Rep*. 2.1.

very paternal figure, and Scipio notes the affection in which he held Cato (*unice dilexi maximeque sum admiratus*).[108] The description of Cato's instruction offered here thus parallels what we find in the *De senectute*. Both works articulate an impression of Cato which clearly derives from his own works, particularly those which he addressed to his son – suggesting, once more, the importance of this relationship for Cato's public image and the significance of these texts for received impressions of the Censor.

Cicero's contemporaries were also interested in Cato as an educational figure. Varro gives one of his *Logistorici* the title, *Catus: De liberis educandis*, in which it is possible to see reference to the Censor. While the protagonists of Varro's *Logistorici* are typically contemporary figures, no one individual can be securely identified with Catus in this case.[109] This raises two distinct possibilities: either Varro's *Catus* ought to be emended to *Cato* and the protagonist identified with the Elder or Younger Cato;[110] or Varro's *Catus* might simply denote one who is *catus*, rather than a specific individual, deliberately allowing the figure to be read in different ways.[111] Indeed, given the popular connection between Cato and *Catus* it is possible that the best reading of Varro's *Catus* is somewhere between these two.[112] The extant fragments of the treatise certainly suggest similarities between Catus and Cato the Elder. *Catus* offers the *pater familias* practical advice, underscored with educational theory, on raising a good Roman citizen. In doing so, *Catus* recalls his own upbringing, 'as a boy I only had one modest tunic and toga, boots without bands, a horse without a saddle, I bathed

[108] Cic. *Rep*. 2.1.
[109] The protagonists of other *Logistorici* include Atticus and one M. Valerius Messalla. Various contemporary figures have been suggested for this role, most plausibly Q. Aelius Tubero, who is also the interlocutor of *Tubero: De origine humana*, and who is thought to have adopted *Catus* as a *cognomen* (Dahlmann (1956); Zucchelli (1981) 39), or his son, Sestius Aelius Catus (cos. AD 4), for whom the *cognomen* is more securely attested (Bolisani (1937) 34).
[110] Müller (1938) 15ff. Macrobius cites Cato as the author of a treatise entitled *De liberis educandis*, which sounds suspiciously like Varro's *Logistoricus*, seemingly happy with this emendation, but rather confused over the work's authorship (Macrob. *Sat*. 3.6.5).
[111] Marcucci (2000) 21. A parallel for this can be found in Varro's protagonist Orestes, who can be identified with a contemporary figure, but whose mythical overtones are also exploited (Zucchelli (1981) 37-42).
[112] See above p.209 n.9.

infrequently, I played games rarely,' (*mihi puero modica una fuit tunica et toga, sine fasceis calciamenta, ecus sine ephippio, balneum non cotidianum, alveus rarus*), in terms which are strongly reminiscent of Cato the Censor.[113] *Catus* also shares Cato's sentiments on luxury, his interests in ethnography, and his oracular authority, all of which present themselves in our fragments.[114] Moreover, *Catus*' declaration that his training is designed to help a child to 'become a good man' (*virum bonum fieri*) clearly evokes the aims of the instruction which Cato offered to his son in the *Liber ad filium*.[115] These strong similarities make it very tempting to think that Varro's *Catus* is to be connected with Cato the Censor; this association would well suit Varro's pattern of use of his protagonists, as well as his interests – and those of his peers - in Cato as an educational figure.[116]

Cicero and his contemporaries invest heavily in the image of Cato as an expert educationalist. This depiction of Cato as a teacher, and particularly as one whose instruction was rich in philosophical wisdom, closely associates the Censor's intellectual interests with the fascination with Hellenic culture commonly found amongst his elite peers. This assimilation of Cato with the Aemilii and the Scipiones, as figures who all shared an appreciation of and aptitude for philosophy, forms an important part of Cicero's construction of the 2nd century BC as a period of widespread cultural consensus.[117] Cicero's works, as discussed here, depict a unified elite, productively engaged both in their own personal intellectual development and

[113] F18; cf. Cato's recollections of the austerity of his own early years found at *ORF*$^{3}$ 128. *Catus* even uses the Graecism *ephippium* rather than the Latin *stratum*, for 'saddle' in an equation of luxury with all things Hellenic which is strongly reminiscent of the Censor.
[114] On luxury: F19; on ethnography: F20; speaking as an oracle: F3,
[115] F23; cf. Cato's *Liber ad Filium*, Fs 6, 18.
[116] On the relationship between Varro's *Logistorici* and Cicero's *De senectute* and *De amicitia*, see Powell (1988) 8-9.
[117] This is particularly clear in the *De senectute* where Cato addresses Scipio and Laelius, budding young Stoics who both went on to study under Panaetius. Laelius and Scipio later came to be recognised as the first Romans who successfully reconciled Greek intellectual curiosity with an adherence to the *mos maiorum*; see Garbarino (1973) 390-412, 425-31.

in their corporate responsibility for Rome's public affairs.[118] While we know that Cato was closely connected with Aemilius Paullus and his family, and that he was well versed in the Greek language and its literature, his attitude towards educational development appears to have been a point of deliberate difference from that of his peers, and in fact, educational forms of this period were characterised by variety, ingenuity, and competition – an impression which is simply not compatible with the homogeneous picture created here by Cicero.[119] Cicero's construction of this period, and of Cato's place within it, thus reflects a personal longing for a politically engaged position within a well functioning Roman state, as much as it does a historical reality.[120] Indeed, Cicero's impression of Cato in the *De senectute*, *De amicitia*, and *De officiis*, is drawn in accordance with the educational and philosophical activities of his own life in recent years; designed to provide precedent for and lend prestige to his final years, and to frame a lasting legacy for himself – most immediately in the philosophical instruction which he leaves for his son, but also in the importance which he has established for a philosophical education – for future generations.[121] The relationship between Cato the Censor and his son holds a remarkably prominent position within Cicero's impression of him here: Cato's forbearance in the face of Licinianus' death forms the focus

[118] There is much truth in this picture. Cato had a close relationship with Aemilius Paullus: marrying his son to one of Paullus' daughters and defending his friend when his triumph from Pydna was subject to contestation. Cicero's observation that Paullus desired Cato's influence upon his son, Scipio Aemilianus, is thus, in all probablity, true (*Rep*. 2.1); and by extension of this, it seems safe to assume that the younger Scipio Africanus, the youth's adopted father, also shared Paullus' feelings, (on the adoption of Paullus' two elder sons into significant political families, see Lindsay (2009) 147-51). Further to this, we are informed that Cato spoke well of Scipio Aemilianus, and the two men appear to have shared similar sentiments on Rome's policy towards Carthage (Plut. *Cat. Mai*. 27.6).

[119] On the reliability of Cicero's writings as evidence for the 2nd century BC, see Rawson (1972) 33-45; Powell (1988) 273-9. Cicero himself tells us that he made use of Brutus' recently compiled epitomes of earlier historical works (*Att*. 13.8, 12.5b) and Atticus' own *Liber Annalis* (*Brut*. 13-5, *Orat*. 120); he wishes that he had the historian Vennonius to hand as he writes (*Att*. 12.3.1), and may also have made use of Nepos' *Chronica*. While Cicero's picture of Cato as well-versed in Greek literature and culture, in a manner much akin to his elite peers, concurs with much of our evidence for the Censor's life, Cicero's vision does not take in any of the competitive, and often antagonistic, individual relationships which characterised much of Cato's interaction with his contemporaries. On the competitive dynamic of educational developments during this period, for example, see above p.173-9.

[120] Cicero already draws attention to the productive and meaningful old age which Cato enjoyed at *Rep*. 1.1. On Cicero's use of Cato to 'articulate his political discontent', see Gildenhard (2007) 140-5.

[121] Cicero urges his son to live up to his example, reminding the youth of the high hopes (*non parvam exspectationem*) that he holds for his emulation of his father's hard work (*imitandae industriae nostrae*) at the start of the final book of the *De officiis* (*Off*. 3.6).

of his philosophical wisdom; the works which Cato wrote for him are influential in their vision of practical, paternal education; and the *Liber ad filium* provides a model for Cicero's instruction of his own son.

## 4.2 Quintilian

Quintilian and his contemporaries, writing in the late 1st and early 2nd century AD, also demonstrate an interest in Cato the Censor as a perfect father and an expert educator. Their works explore the educational ideals embodied in his *Liber ad filium*, creating an idealised vision of traditional Roman education that is practical in emphasis, pragmatic in delivery, and paternally directed. This vision is readily connected with the 2nd century BC in general, and with Cato the Censor and his *Liber ad filium* in particular. This work especially informs Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* and the construction of the ideal orator that we find therein. The writings of the early empire, then, continue to invest in Cicero's vision of Cato as an educator, a vision which Cato himself played no small part in promoting.

### Quintilian: Teacher and Father

Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* offers the clearest impression of this educational ideal and the clearest attempt to connect this ideal to the life and works of Cato the Censor. While Quintilian does not advocate a father's personal tuition of his sons, nonetheless, he urges fathers to take an interest in their sons' education and he opholds the father-son relationship as a model for that of the school-teacher and his pupil.[122] Quintilian invokes Cato's

[122] On the merits of schools over private tuition, particularly for the budding orator, see Quint. *Inst.* 1.2.1-31.

instruction of Licinianus as an important paradigm for these principles. Quintilian's treatise is predicated on a father's interest in the education of his son. The work's opening urges new fathers to conceive lofty ambitions for their boys; these aspirations will require a rhetorical education, and the direction of that education will provide for Quintilian's employment. Thus he exhorts, 'as soon as his son is born, the father should form the highest expectations of him,' (*igitur nato filio pater spem de illo primum quam optimam capiat*).[123] Once in the care of a tutor, Quintilian urges his students to honour and to love that tutor as they would a parent; 'they should love their teachers as they do their studies and think of them as the parents not of their bodies but of their minds,' (*praeceptores suos non minus quam ipsa studia ament et parentes esse non quidem corporum, sed mentium credant*).[124] Similarly, a teacher is to treat his pupils as though they were his own sons. This quality is the first in Quintilian's list of the attributes of a good rhetor; 'first of all, then, let him adopt a paternal attitude towards his pupils, and regard himself as taking the place of those whose children are entrusted to him,' (*sumat igitur ante omnia parentis erga discipulos suos animum, ac succedere se in eorum locum a quibus sibi liberi tradantur existimet*).[125] It is also a quality which will characterise the didactic role that Quintilian imagines for his ideal orator on his retirement, a figure he describes as the 'father of eloquence' (*eloquentiae parens*), whose teaching inspires the next generation of orators.[126] The paternal relationship of a tutor to his students, regardless of their age or ability, is thus central to Quintilian's view of a good educator. This paternal paradigm for education can be traced back to Cato, who placed his personal relationship with Licinianus at the heart of his didactic works.

[123] Quint. *Inst*. 1.1.1. All translations of Quintilian are taken from Russell (2001).
[124] Quint. *Inst*. 2.9.1.
[125] Quint. *Inst*. 2.2.4.
[126] Quint. *Inst*. 12.11.5. Quintilian's vision of the retired orator echoes Cicero's depiction of Cato in the *De senectute*, see below p.239 n.148.

Quintilian also constructs his own relationship with the readers of the *Institutio oratoria* in these terms. The work is dedicated to an acquaintance of Quintilian's, one Marcus Vitorius, whose son, Geta, Quintilian believes will benefit from its contents: 'I think that these books will be useful for the education of your [Marcus Vitorius'] son Geta, whose early years already show such clear promise of talent,' (*erudiendo Getae tuo, cuius prima aetas manifestum iam ingenii lumen ostendit, non inutiles fore libri videbantur*).[127] The *Institutio oratoria* is thus constructed as a guide for one particular father, in order to help him organise the provision of a proper education of his son. Quintilian also tells us that he intended his work to form part of the education of his own son.[128] The treatise would have formed the 'most precious part of the inheritance' (*optimam partem relicturus hereditatis*) that Quintilian had hoped to leave to the boy, a young man 'whose ability was so remarkable that it called for the most anxious cultivation' (*cuius eminens ingenium sollicitam quoque parentis diligentiam merebatur*), thus allowing him to 'enjoy the benefit of his father's instruction' (*praeceptore tamen patre uteretur*), even after Quintilian's death.[129] In these lines, prominently positioned at the very centre of his work, Quintilian makes the paternal ideals of his educational practice overwhelmingly personal: the text itself thus becomes an example of the paternal instruction which it recommends and the teacher it describes becomes a portrait of its author.[130]

Quintilian makes use of his own experiences as a father to draw particular parallels between himself and Cato the Censor. These parallels strengthen Quintilian's connection to the Censor as he seeks to make use of Cato's image to lend authority to the educational methods which

[127] Quint. *Inst*. 1 *praef*. 6.
[128] At least initially - after Quintilian adopted a position as tutor to Domitian's great-nephews, his imperial charges become the focus of the work (*Inst*. 4 *praef*. 1-3).
[129] Quint. *Inst*. 6 *praef*. 1.
[130] On the *Institutio oratoria* as Quintilian's self-portrait, see Fitzgerald (1969).

he espouses here. To this end, Quintilian describes his grief at the premature death of his son in terms which vividly evoke the lament of Cicero's character Cato for Licinianus at the conclusion of the *De senectute*. Quintilian stresses the boy's talents, noting his 'remarkable ability' (*eminens ingenium*),[131] and the achievements that he had already attained, 'he had shown not just promising flowers, like his brother, but, by the time he entered his tenth year, well-formed fruits,' (*non enim flosculos, sicut prior, sed iam decimum aetatis ingressus annum certos ac deformatos fructus ostenderat*),[132] as well as his noble character 'excellences... of honesty, piety, humanity, and generosity,' (*virtutes... probitatis pietatis humanitatis liberalitatis*).[133] These terms evoke those in which Cicero's Cato mourned for his son as a man of remarkable virtue, 'than whom no better man has been born, none superior in piety,' (*quo nemo vir melior natus est, nemo pietate praestantior*), and in which he was described by Laelius as of established professional success, 'an accomplished and distinguished man,' (*perfecto et spectato viro*).[134] Both Quintilian and Cato lament the premature nature of their losses; Quintilian describing his son's 'untimely pyre,' (*inmaturum funus*),[135] and the reversal of natural order which his death constituted, 'if fate cut me off – and this would have been fair and greatly to be wished,' (*si me, quod aecum et optabile fuit, fata intercepissent*);[136] while Cato remarked upon the unnatural act of cremating his son 'whose body has been burnt by me, rather than mine by him, as is proper,' (*cuius a me corpus est crematum, quod contra decuit ab illo meum*).[137] Cato and Quintilian both showed remarkable forbearance in the face of their loss. Quintilian remarks that, 'no man grieves long save through his own fault,' (*nemo nisi sua culpa diu dolet*);[138] and Cicero has Cato find

[131] Quint. *Inst*. 6 *praef*. 1.
[132] Quint. *Inst*. 6 *praef*. 10.
[133] Quint. *Inst*. 6 *praef*. 10.
[134] Cic. *Amic*. 9.
[135] Quint. *Inst*. 6 *praef*. 3.
[136] Quint. *Inst*. 6 *praef*. 1.
[137] Cic. *Sen*. 84.
[138] Quint. *Inst*. 6 *praef*. 13.

philosophical consolation for the loss of Licinianus: 'I found constant solace in the thought that our separation would not be long,' (*me ipse consolabar existimans non longinquum inter nos digressum et discessum fore*), putting on a brave face in these difficult circumstances: 'people think that I have bravely borne my loss,' (*quem ego meum casum fortiter ferre visus sum*).[139] The terms in which Quintilian describes the loss of his son are strongly reminiscent of those in which Cicero's character Cato laments for Licinianus. While it can be argued that much of the lament which Quintilian offers for his sons is highly conventional, in the light of the broader connection which Quintilian creates between himself and the Censor in this work, this is surely a case of deliberate imitation.[140] Indeed, if it is correct to see Quintilian's lament for his sons as a conventional piece, and a prime example of the *peroratio*, this only encourages us to see this passage as part of a wider connection with Cato the Censor. Cicero has Cato's lament for the death of his son as the *peroratio* of the *De Senectute* – thus even in its conventionality, Quintilian's lament recollects that of the Censor. The emphasis which Quintilian places upon the similarities between his own paternal experience and that of Cato serves to draw an ever closer connection with the Censor and his image as an expert educator and a perfect father. Quintilian, thus, not only has Cato's educational ideal inform the paternally directed instruction advocated in the *Institutio oratoria* and frame the work's immediate purpose in this paternal guise, but he also fashions his own life experiences in such a way as to forge a connection with the Censor.

***Orator Perfectus***

[139] Cic. *Sen*. 84. Cicero also has the characters of the *De amicitia* discuss Cato's fortitude as one of the qualities which recommended him for the title of *vir sapiens* (*Amic*. 9).
[140] Leigh (2004b) sees this passage as a piece of 'superficially personal material' (123), which he claims is, in fact, a 'textbook example' (136) of the lament often found in the *peroratio*, offering Cic. *Inv*. *rhet*. 1.107 – a specimen lament for a lost child - as a parallel.

Quintilian's ideal orator – the educational goal for each of his pupils and the end-point of their instruction under his tutelage - is articulated in terms taken from the Censor. Quintilian's description of this orator is based upon Cato's statement to Licinianus in the *Liber ad filium* that 'an orator, Marcus my son, is a good man and an experienced speaker,' (*orator est, Marce fili, vir bonus, dicendi peritus*).[141] In his reuse of this line, Quintilian returns to what he believes to be the earliest Roman account of rhetoric, taking his own definition of the orator from a source of significant authority and antiquity.[142] This definition of the orator is reworked and repeated at several strategic points in the *Institutio oratoria*. The first of these references is in the preface to the first book of the work, in which Quintilian sets out his purpose; 'I am proposing to educate the perfect orator, who cannot exist except in the person of a good man. We therefore demand of him not only exceptional powers of speech, but all the virtues of character as well' (*oratorem autem instituimus illum perfectum, qui esse nisi vir bonus non potest, ideoque non dicendi modo eximiam in eo facultatem sed omnis animi virtutes exigimus*).[143] Cato's admonition is also recalled in the second book of the work. Here Quintilian offers an answer to the question 'what is rhetoric?' and recounts the major difference of opinion with regard to the answer in these terms: 'some think bad men also can be orators, and others, with whose view I agree, confine this name, and the art of which we are speaking, to the good,' (*alii malos quoque viros posse oratores dici putant, alii, quorum nos sententiae accedimus, nomen hoc artemque de qua loquimur bonis demum tribui volunt*).[144] The most direct recollection of Cato's words comes at the opening of the final book of Quintilian's work, which sets out a vision of Quintilian's ideal orator; 'so let the orator whom we are setting up be, as Cato defines him, 'a good man skilled in speaking': but

[141] F18.
[142] Quint. *Inst*. 3.1.19; Quintilian is eager to emphasise his careful research into earlier rhetorical treatises. In taking his definition of the orator from Cato, Quintilian can capitalise not only on the Censor's educational authority, but also upon his renown as a speaker and the reputation of the period in which he lived as the pinnacle of the political achievement of the Roman Republic.
[143] Quint. *Inst*. 1 *praef*. 9.
[144] Quint. *Inst*. 2.15.1.

– and Cato put this first, and it is intrinsically more significant and important – let him at all events be 'a good man',' (*sit ergo nobis orator quem constituimus is qui a M. Catone finitur vir bonus dicendi peritus, verum, id quod et ille posuit prius et ipsa natura potius ac maius est, utique vir bonus*).[145] The recurrence of Cato's definition of the good orator at such strategic points within the *Institutio oratoria* demonstrates the importance of his judgement for Quintilian's definition of the *orator perfectus*.[146] The varied reworkings of Cato's phrase act to interweave the Censor's words with Quintilian's own thought at an early stage in the treatise.[147] The phrase is then quoted with full attribution to Cato, as part of the author's final vision of the fully completed orator in Book Twelve, thus sealing the importance of Quintilian's aim with the full weight of Cato's authority.[148] Cato's educational ideal thus forms the culmination of Quintilian's oratorical instruction.

Quintilian's use of the Censor's phrase within the *Institutio oratoria* has clear political and philosophical concerns which, distinct from those of Cato's original statement, reflect both the development of Cato's image during the previous centrury, particularly at the hands of Cicero, and the declining cultural and political circumstances of Quintilian's day. Quintilian's concern for the moral worth of his orator, then, has been connected with the successes of the *delatores*.[149] These informers, with their unscrupulous use of their own brand of rhetoric, appear to be the targets of much of the moralising of rhetoric which Quintilian undertakes in the *Institutio*. Quintilian's quotation of Cato thus plays a central role in what is not an effort

[145] Quint. *Inst*. 12.1.1.
[146] Indeed, for authors writing after Quintilian, Cato's words become the default definition of the orator, see above p.109-10.
[147] Although the familiarity of Cato's work, to which the reworkings of Fs 18-9 amply testify, would surely allow Quintilian's audience to recognise the reference.
[148] The image of the retired orator, now engaged in instructing the next generation of Romans, which Quintilian offers at the end of Book Twelve is also notably Catonian in nature; the description of this figure as surrounded by talented youths, glorying in his subject, and instructing them by way of his expert knowledge and wide-ranging experience (Quint. *Inst*. 12.11.4-6), directly recalls Cicero's representation of Cato in the *De Senectute*, on which, see above p.227-30.
[149] Winterbottom (1964).

to create an abstract definition of the perfect profession, but is, in fact, a 'concrete response to a particular situation'.[150] Several other writers of this period also make use of the phrase in a similar context.[151] Seneca quotes Cato's definition of the orator as part of a widespread condemnation of the lazy and luxurious ways which characterised contemporary orators.[152] Pliny cites an instance where Herennius Senecio applied Cato's phrase to a single contemporary only, condemning one Regulus, a well known *delator,* as a bad man and a poor speaker.[153] It is likely that Cato's original formulation had also been fashioned by his political concerns; his suspicion of the amoral approach to rhetorical training taken by Carneades, his concern for the personal morality of politicians, and his own boasts about his virtue are well attested.[154] However, Quintilian's use of the phrase is a very particular development of this, invoking Cato's words in condemnation of a specific practice, rather than as an articulation of a general principle for politics. Quintilian clearly felt that Cato's words were endowed with a timeless authority, ready to be reworked and reapplied, even under new and different circumstances. This suggests something of the reputation enjoyed by Cato's teachings as classical texts - providing the touchstone for Roman thought.

Quintilian's ideal orator is not simply drawn in response to his political situation, designed to oppose the activities of the *delatores,* but the *orator perfectus* is also conceived along philosophical, and specifically Stoic, lines. To begin with, Quintilian adopts the Stoic definition of rhetoric itself as the *scientia bene dicendi*;[155] then Quintilian takes his definition of art, and of rhetoric as an art from Zeno;[156] and his definition of the ideal orator in book

[150] Habinek (1987) 193.
[151] See above p.109.
[152] Sen. *Contr.* 1 *praef.* 9.
[153] Plin. *Ep.* 4.7.4-5.
[154] See above p.114.
[155] Quint. *Inst.* 2.15.33-5. The phrase acts as a 'type' definition, in which Quintilian offers a standard defining formula for a view held by a range of different individuals; see Granatelli (2001) *ad loc.*
[156] Quint. *Inst*. 2.17.41 with Reinhardt and Winterbottom (2006) *ad loc.*

twelve, of which Cato's maxim proves a central part, is also dependent upon Stoic thought. The language of the preface to this book recalls that of the Stoa; Quintilian states that he will teach the 'moral principles' (*mores*) and 'duties' (*officia*) of the ideal orator.[157] Furthermore, for Quintilian, man's capabilities for *ratio* and *oratio* are the gift of nature and, as such, the study of rhetoric follows the Stoic dictate that life is to be lived in accordance with nature.[158] Quintilian's belief that 'no one can be an orator unless he is a good man,' (*ne futurum quidem oratorem nisi virum bonum*), is also a product of Stoic thought, which equates *stultus* and *malus*, as only a fool would choose the way of vice.[159] Quintilian's ideal orator, then, owes much in his construction to Stoic thought.[160]

Quintilian's prominent citation of Cato within this philosophical context allows him to colour his fundamentally foreign doctrine with a distinctly Roman hue.[161] This was of significant advantage for Quintilian's authorial strategy. A close connection between the ideal orator and the Stoic sage offered few advantages for the promotion of Quintilian's didactic methods: the philosophers of his day were remote figures, removed from everyday life, viewed by Quintilian himself as mere 'theorists';[162] in addition, the Stoics, in particular, were notoriously bad orators.[163] In calling upon Cato's definition of the orator at this point, then, Quintilian counters his predominantly Greek, philosophical construction of the *orator perfectus* by clearly identifying him with a resolutely Roman figure, full of practical wisdom

[157] On these terms, see above p.218.
[158] Quint. *Inst*. 12.1.2; see Diog. Laert. 7.87-8; Cic. *Fin*. 3.5-6; for a discussion of the principle, see Mitsis (2003) 258-63.
[159] Quint. *Inst*. 12.1.3. Cf. Sen. *Ben*. 4.26.2 (and *passim*), *Ep*. 59.17; Lactant. *Div. inst*. 5.17.25-6, 29. Although Leigh finds Quintilian's use of Cato's phrase rather more conventional (Leigh (2004b) 132).
[160] Habinek holds Quintilian's ideal orator is a 'new improved version of the sage of Greek, especially Stoic philosophy' ((1987) 192).
[161] Reinhardt and Winterbottom (2006) xlvi-l.
[162] Quint. *Inst*. 5.11.39 with Winterbottom (1998) 318.
[163] Cicero had previously singled out Cato the Younger as the only Stoic who was also a good orator (Cic. *Brut*. 118).

and rich in oratorical experience.[164] Quintilian's decision to place Cato's proverb at the centre of his ideal orator thus calls upon the 'archetypal Roman figure of authority' to validate his intellectual views on rhetoric and to affirm his skill as an educator.[165]

Quintilian was certainly not the first writer to make use of the figure of the Censor to recast Greek philosophical doctrine as traditional Roman wisdom: Cicero uses an almost identical strategy in his final philosophical works. These works present Cato as a distinctly philosophical figure, though of a practical and non-professional nature. Cato is clearly connected with Stoic views and values, and this clever representation of the Censor lends precedent and prestige to Cicero's philosophical activities.[166] Both Cicero and Quintilian, then, use the figure of Cato to fashion their philosophical beliefs in a resolutely Roman manner.[167]

Quintilian's *orator perfectus* was thus constructed upon Cato's teachings. These teachings are used to articulate a contemporary vision of the orator which is profoundly engaged with Quintilian's immediate political situation and with his personal philosophical views. In this respect, Quintilian's remodelling of Cato may take its cue from that of Cicero in the previous century. Cato's words act to confirm the authority and antiquity of the approach of

[164] There is no suggestion that Cato's *vir bonus* was conceived of, or interpreted as, the technical, Stoic *vir bonus*. On the improbability of the Censor conceiving the figure in this light, see above p.114; see also Leigh (2004b) 132 n. 84; on the unlikelihood of Quintilian's audience interpreting the figure in this manner, see Reinhardt and Winterbottom (2006) xlvi-l.

[165] Reinhardt and Winterbottom (2006) xlviii.

[166] Notably Cicero, like Quinitilian, does not connect Cato's *vir bonus* with the technical, Stoic figure. Cicero's sole allusion to Cato's phrase has a clearly political character (Cic. *De or*. 2.85 with Leeman et al. (1985) *ad loc.* and Wilkins ((1892) *ad loc*.); he also notes that Cato himself would fail to meet the requirements of a technical *vir bonus* (Cic. *Amic*. 18-21).

[167] While their use of Cato is similar, Cicero and Quintilian appear to relate philosophy to oratory in different ways: Cicero emphasising the importance of philosophy for enhancing the content of the speech, and Quintilian highlighting its role in developing the character of the orator. There is ample bibliography on this subject; see, for example, Winterbottom (1964), (1998); Leigh (2004b); Reinhardt and Winterbottom (2006).

Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*: the author's use of Cato as a touchstone for Roman republican values demonstrates something of the classic status which Cato's works, and particularly the *Liber ad filium*, enjoyed.

**An Educational Ideal**

The ideal of an education overseen by one's *parens*, and directed by a teacher acting *in loco parentis*, advocated by Quintilian in the *Institutio oratoria*, is also discussed – in different guises - within the works of his later contemporaries. Pliny, Tacitus, and Juvenal all describe the importance of a father's practical involvement in his son's education. Notably, all three authors locate this practice of paternal instruction firmly in the past: Pliny notes the tradition of young men accompanying their fathers to the senate in times gone by (*antiquitus institutum*);[168] Tacitus' Messalla describes the practice of fathers taking their sons for training under expert orators as occuring in previous generations (*apud maiores nostros*);[169] and Juvenal ascribed the view that a teacher was akin to a parent to the ancestors (*di maiores*).[170] The past age imagined by these authors appears to be the 2nd century BC:[171] the interest of our authors in these paternal and practical patterns of education, which they take as typical of the period, forms part of a general longing for an age of purposeful political engagement; Pliny describes the pupils as future 'participants in public debate' (*consilii publici... consortes*);[172] Tacitus' Messalla imagines students seeing eminent orators speak in all sorts of situations, including the law courts and the assembly (*huius omnibus dictionibus interesse*

[168] Plin. *Ep*. 8.14.4.
[169] Tac. *Dial*. 34.1.
[170] Juv. 7.207-10.
[171] Pliny describes these paternal habits as part of a longer passage contrasting past and present senatorial practice (*Ep*. 8.14.4-6) and Tacitus contrasts past oratorical training based in the forum and present instruction given in schools (*Dial*. 34.1ff); these comparisons are thus likely to centre upon the 2nd century BC, an age which was recognised as early as Cicero as the healthiest and most active period for the senate in Roman politics and was typically identified as the high-point of Republic; see Sherwin-White (1966) *ad* Plin. *Ep*. 8.14.4-6.
[172] Plin. *Ep*. 8.14.5.

*sive in iudiciis sive in contionibus*).[173] These imaginings were likely informed and influenced by Quintilian's work, with the parallelism between teacher and parent that is so central to his method of education picked up verbally in all three authors - Pliny (*parens pro magistro*), Tacitus (*deducebatur a patre*), and Juvenal (*praeceptor... parentis... / loco*).[174] It thus seems likely that Cato the Censor lay behind this image of paternal education for Quintilian's later contemporaries, too. However, their treatment of this image is rather different from that of Quintilian; locating this form of education explicitly in the past, Pliny suggests that such practices are no longer attainable under the present political conditions; Tacitus appears to question the validity of such a practice - even in the past – by placing its description in the mouth of Messalla, a figure full of hopelessly rose-tinted nostalgia;[175] and Juvenal states that the teaching profession is now so poorly regarded that only Quintilian, with his imperial patronage, makes a profit.[176] None of these authors share in the positive inspiration taken from this form of education that is found in the *Institutio oratoria*. This image of instruction - inspired by Cato - of paternal and practical nature, is of unique importance to Quintilian, who calls for its value to be recognised in modern schools and teaching methods; while his contemporaries appeal to the idea as part of a wider sense of frustration with the current political climate and of longing for a past age, with no such suggestion of the system's validity then or now.[177]

---

[173] Tac. *Dial*. 34.2.

[174] Plin. *Ep*. 8.14.6; Tac. *Dial*. 34.1; Juv. 7.209-10. We know that Pliny, as a pupil of Quintilian, had first hand experience of his educational methods (Plin. *Ep*. 2.14.9, 6.6.3); Tacitus' *Dialogus* was published after, and, in part, in response to, Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (Mayer (2001) 22-7); Juvenal clearly knew of Quintilian and the nature of his work as a teacher (Juv. 7.186-8).

[175] Fantham describes him as a 'young fogey' ((1996) 198); Winterbottom and Reinhardt also note that the character is 'overdone and implausible' (2006) xlii. On the difficulties of interpreting the *Dialogus*, see Goldberg (2009) 73-84.

[176] Juv. 7.186-8. The speaker at this point appears to be in sympathy with the plight of these teachers, yet within a few lines, this sympathy dissolves into parody of the nostalgia for the educational practices of former ages, and ironic slights on the quality of modern teachers. For an analysis of the passage, see Braund (1988) 64-6. For the contrasting idea that teachers were relatively well thought of, see Fantham (1996) 198-200.

[177] Indeed, Cato's own invocation of these practices in the story of Papirius Praetextatus (*ORF*$^{3}$ 172) suggests that a strong current of idealism surrounded the idea of paternal education even in the 2$^{nd}$ century BC, see above p.160-3.

**Conclusion**

The *Institutio oratoria* sets out an educational model which is heavily paternal. Quintilian recommends a father-son relationship for teacher and pupil and is clear to construct his authorial relationship with the work's addressee along these lines. Quintilian attributes this paternal aspect to his instruction to Cato – paralleling his own personal experiences of fatherhood with those of the Censor. Cato was also a significant influence on Quintilian's ideal orator, connecting this figure to Rome's most ancient and authoritative public speaker and allowing Quintilian to confirm the value of his educational methods as set out in the *Institutio oratoria*. Quintilian's later contemporaries also show an interest in the paternal and practical dynamics of early Roman education; however, their presentation of these phenomena is one marked by idealism and irony. Nonetheless, the significance of Cato's educational works even for the writers of this period is clear. The Censor's relationship with his son, his educational ideals, and his didactic works, provide a profitable medium through which contemporary ideas about the changing nature of education, oratory, and public life, can be articulated.

## 4.3 *Disticha Catonis*

The final work to be discussed in this section is the *Disticha Catonis*, a loose collection of maxims written in hexameter couplets, which claims to have been composed by Cato the Censor. The *Disticha* offers its readers advice on a range of moral and ethical topics; the focus of its instruction falling upon financial and social matters – subjects often treated in collections of traditional wisdom. It is very unlikely that the *Disticha* were actually composed

by Cato; however, these maxims share some of their style and content with the sayings widely attributed to the Censor, and they invoke Cato – in a notably paternal aspect - prominently in their title, prefatory epistle, and in the work's suffix. The text is much more likely to be the work of an anonymous schoolmaster and has been convincingly dated to around AD 100.[178] If not designed by a teacher specifically for use in schools, the *Disticha Catonis* were certainly readily adapted to this context.[179] The work came to be widely used as a textbook - its popularity spreading across the empire to see it become an important part of the European educational tradition.[180] The attempts of the writer and early readers of the *Disticha* to connect the work with the authorship of Cato the Censor clearly demonstrate the strength of contemporary impressions of the Censor as a perfect father and as an expert educator. The *Disticha Catonis* thus continues and culminates an image of Cato prominent in the late works of Cicero, and in the writings of Pliny, Tacitus, and Quintilian. The work provides a crucial link in transmitting this image of Cato, the perfect father and expert educator, to later ages, with the widespread popularity of the *Disticha Catonis* sealing the centrality of this aspect of his personality within the reception of the Censor.

**The Proverbs**

Several of the maxims which feature in the four books of the *Disticha Catonis* exhibit notably Catonian features. The work's opening distich asks the readers for their full attention,

[178] Connolly provides detailed literary and historical evidence to connect the *Disticha Catonis* to this period ((2012) 119). Older scholarship has traditionally seen the work as rather later than this, dating it to the late 2nd or even 3rd centuries AD; see, for example, Roos ((1984) 188); a list of scholars who maintain this view is given at Connolly (2012) 119 n.1.

[179] On the use of such *sententiae* in Roman schools, see, for example, Sen. *Ep*. 33.7, 94.9; Quint. *Inst*. 1.1.35.

[180] Scholars have termed the *Disticha Catonis* the 'greatest schoolbook in the history of Western education', (Bloomer (2011) 142). The work was translated into Greek by Maximus Planudes in the late 13th century, allowing its popularity to grow in the East of Rome's empire (something which is confirmed in the number of manuscripts of this translations (Ortoleva (1992) vii – xi)); almost every renaissance scholar of note, including both Desiderius Erasmus and Joseph Scaliger, appears to have produced an edition of the *Disticha*; and such editions continued to be produced well into the 19th century. Our evidence thus reflects the work's widespread geographical reach, its scholarly importance, and its remarkable longevity.

affirming the divine nature of the human soul and the importance of its cultivation, 'if god is our conscience, as the sayings tell, this book above all you ought to attend to with undivided concentration,' (*si deus est animus nobis, ut carmina dicunt, / hic tibi praecipue sit pura mente colendus*).[181] This presentation of the teachings of the *Disticha Catonis* as an important guide for upholding the divine spark of the human spirit, suggests a connection between the work's authorial voice and Cato the Censor, whose words were regularly attributed with oracular, even divine qualities.[182] The *Liber ad filium*, in particular, has been associated with oracular utterance, and it presents a didactic scenario very similar to that of the *Disticha*. The final distich of the work also recollects the Censor; 'you wonder that I write verses with unadorned words; brevity has accomplished this, joining together two lines of verse into one sense,' (*miraris verbis nudis me scribere versus; / hoc brevitas fecit, sensu coniungere binos*).[183] The author here calls attention to the simplicity and the brevity of his words - qualities for which Cato the Censor was well known.[184] In addition to these strategically placed allusions, between ten and twelve of the other *disticha* have been traced back directly to utterances of Cato the Censor. These *disticha*, identified by Roos as including 2.16, 17, 19, 3.5, 8, 13, 15, 17-9, 21, appear to be grouped together within the work, suggesting that the author of the *Disticha* may have used an existing collection of Cato's *sententiae* as a source text for sections of his work.[185] It is likely that a variety of such collections were in circulation at the time of the *Disticha*'s composition, so this is a distinct possibility.[186] One of

[181] *DC* 1.1.
[182] On the divine qualities of Cato's *sententiae*, see Hor. *Sat*. 1.2.32; Sen. *Contr*. 1 *praef*. 9; Columella, *Rust*. 11.1.26; Plin. *HN* 7.171, 28.40, 28.174, 28.200. See also above p.63-4, 127-8. This distich has been used as evidence for Cato the Younger's authorship of the work (Connolly (2012)); however, while Cato Uticensis is referred to as divine on several occasions by writers of this period, his divinity is typically based upon his actions, rather than his words, as in the case of the Elder Cato. This suggests that any association here is to the Censor, rather than to his descendant.
[183] *DC* 4.49.
[184] For Cato's recommendations of brevity in speech, see above on F19. For later perceptions of Cato as a writer characterised by such brevity, see Cic. *De or*. 2.51ff; *Leg*. 1.6.
[185] Roos (1984) 190-1.
[186] See above p.35-7.

these collections may even have provided a model for the work as a whole.[187] It is difficult to determine the exact nature of the connection between the content of the *Disticha Catonis* and the works of Cato; the *Disticha*'s author may have consulted Cato's *Apophthegmata,* or a collection based upon it, directly; he may have made use of the *Liber ad filium* as a model for the work; or he may simply be using his own knowledge of traditional sayings, and associating it with a conveniently sententious figure in the form of the Censor. While the content of these maxims is difficult to trace firmly to Cato's writings, the Censor appears to be deliberately invoked in the first and last distichs of the collection. These strategic allusions to Cato suggest that the author of the *Disticha* sought to assimilate his voice to Cato's own, capitalising upon the Censor's didactic and paternal authority in order to enhance the appeal of his instruction.

**The Paratext**

The beginning and end of the *Disticha Catonis* were elaborated with further allusions to Cato the Censor. The *Disticha Catonis* itself opens with a prefatory epistle which is addressed from a father to his son. The author presents the collection of maxims as his personal instruction to the boy, 'now I will teach you, my beloved son, the way in which you should set your soul's moral standard,' (*nunc te, fili carissime, docebo quo pacto morem animi tui componas*), before urging him to 'read my maxims in such a way that you may understand them,' (*praecepta mea ita legito ut intellegas*) cautioning him that 'for to read and not to understand is to be neglectful,' (*legere enim et non intellegere neglegere est*).[188] The epistle has been convincingly dated to around the time of the work's composition.[189] If not original, it is likely to be a very early addition and can be traced to our earliest and best preserved

[187] Both Bloomer ((2011) 153) and Connolly ((2012) 120) suggest the *Liber ad filium* as the inspiration for the *Disticha Catonis*.
[188] Boas and Botschuyver (1952) 4.
[189] Boas (1934); Boas and Botschuyver (1952) 95-6; Roos (1984) 189; Connolly (2012).

manuscripts.[190] The address of 'my beloved son' (*fili carissime*) does not, on its own, connect the work to Cato the Censor. The use of *fili* in the vocative was a common address from a a teacher to his pupil.[191] Indeed, the epistolary prefaces often found opening didactic works were frequently figured as written from a father to his son.[192] Nonetheless, the paternal address – particularly in a didactic context – has been closely connected with Cato the Censor and it seems probable that the Censor is behind this paternal paradigm too. Two slightly later additions to the manuscripts of the *Disticha Catonis* strongly suggest that the work's epistle, if it was not written as though in the voice of the Censor, was certainly read in this way from a very early stage in the *Disticha*'s existence.

The work's title is the first of these additions and it appears to have been added to the copies of the text either at an early stage in its life or at its initial circulation.[193] The most common title for the work given in the manuscripts is *Dicta Marci Catonis ad filium (suum)*.[194] The title is present in the manuscript traditions, Φ $\Psi^{v}$ $\Psi^{r}$. Notably, both the title and the epistle are present in the *codex Veronensis* 163, which dates from the 9th century. Rediscovered in 1872, this manuscript exhibits significant differences from the vulgar tradition and has been heralded by scholars from Scaliger - who was a remarkably careful editor of the *Disticha* - onwards as a particularly authoritative and reliable copy.[195] The title is thus well attested within the manuscript tradition and likely to be a relatively early addition to the texts. This title can refer to the *Disticha Catonis* as a whole; however, it often serves as a title only to the epistle, or to the epistle and collection of short prose maxims which both preface the four

[190] The epistle appears in two different manuscript traditions, both Φ and $\Psi^{v}$and $\Psi^{r}$; the only codices in which it doesn't appear are H, E, F, and K; it appears in T, but without its title. For an overview of the manuscript traditions of the *Disticha*, see Boas and Botschuyver (1952) lix-lxiv.
[191] See, for example, Gell. *NA* 13.20.5 with *TLL* s.v. *filius, -i,* 6.1.757.80. On the figuring of teacher-pupil relations as kinship bonds, see *Dig*. 40.2.11-14.
[192] See above p.128 n.415, 206.
[193] A 4th century letter describes the work as *illud Catonis*; see Connolly (2012) 120.
[194] Boas and Botschuyver (1952) lxv.
[195] Boas (1912) 70.

books of distichs which form the main body of the work. This suggests that the paternal relationship, so prominent in the epistle, was the portion of the text most readily associated with that of Cato and Licinianus, and that the strength of this association prevailed, even when the rest of its contents – beyond the early prose sections - proved an unlikely match for the Censor's literary output. The work's title, then, points to the close connection not only of the *Disticha Catonis*, but also of the paternal paradigm so prominent in late Latin didactic, with Cato the Censor.[196]

The second addition to the manuscripts of the *Disticha Catonis* which strongly suggests a connection with Cato is an epitaph for his son, which is added to the end of several manuscripts and is referred to as the *epitafium filii Catonis*.[197] The epitaph is found in several codices ($G^m$, R, X, and Q) of the $V^v$ $V^r$ $V^{rm}$ stem. It is thus a much more recent addition to the text than either the epistle or the title and belongs only to the vulgar tradition. While the epitaph is not, therefore, a reference which testifies to the author's association of his work with Cato, it certainly attests to the willingness of later editors to connect the work with the Censor and with his eldest son, Licinianus, suggesting the enduring strength of images of Cato as a paternal and educational figure.

The manuscript tradition of the *Disticha Catonis* thus strongly suggests that the work had a long history of association with Cato the Censor. This connection may have been a deliberate one made by the work's author, or it may have originated with early editors of the text, or simply have grown up through popular readings of the work. The connection of the *Disticha*

[196] It may be profitable to connect the *Disticha*'s title with Varro's work, *Catus: De liberis educandis*; if the *Logistoricus* was connected with Cato the Censor then the *Disticha* would find a good precedent for a title of this ilk in the Varronian treatise.
[197] Boas and Botschuyver (1952) 268-9.

with Cato certainly shows the prevalence of the impression of the Censor as a perfect father and an expert educator during this period.

**Which Cato?**

Recent research has sought to identify the Cato of the *Disticha Catonis* with Cato the Younger, rather than with Cato the Elder. In arguing this point, Connolly has emphasised both the Stoic content of the *Disticha*, which would readily connect the work to the philosophy of Cato Utincensis, and the popularity of Cato the Younger during the 1st century AD.[198] The work of this thesis, I believe, demonstrates that this cannot be the case. Although Cato the Younger was a popular figure for this period, scholarly interest in Cato the Elder, and particularly in the Elder Cato as an educator, also reached a peak in the early 2nd century AD.[199] Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, published shortly before the accepted date for the *Disticha*, demonstrates the profound influence of Cato as a father and as an educator; the Censor and the works which he wrote for his son were also mentioned by Seneca, and the idea of paternal education featured prominently in Pliny and Tacitus. Valerius Maximus is also known to have recounted stories of the Censor and his son. Not only was the Elder Cato a figure of interest for the 1st century AD, then, but this interest was specifically related to his relationship with his son and to his didactic works, both elements of great importance for the *Disticha Catonis*. Interest in Cato the Younger was largely as a figure of abstract moral virtue.[200] The virtue of Cato the Younger, then, has been connected by Connolly to the broadly Stoic beliefs which underlie the *Disticha Catonis*.[201] It is also possible to call upon

[198] Connolly (2012).
[199] The biographical tradition based upon Cato the Younger continued to florish during this century, with contributions from Munatius Rufus and Thrasea Paetus, as well as the heroizing depiction of Cato within the work of Lucan.
[200] As Connolly herself admits ((2012) 119-25).
[201] Connolly (2013) 228; early titles for the *Disticha* appear to have included *Libri Catonis Pilosophi*, evidence which certainly suggests that the collection was felt to have a philosophical bent.

the evidence furnished by this thesis here. It has been demonstrated above that for the likes of Cicero, Horace, and Quintilian, Cato the Elder and his didactic works held distinctly Stoic associations. Moreover, for these authors Cato the Elder's brand of Stoicism was closely affiliated to practical wisdom and good common sense, while the Stoicism of Cato the Younger, was felt to be unattainable and remote from the average Roman.[202] Indeed, the exemplary nature of the Censor, has, by the 1st century AD, developed well beyond that of expert soldier, orator, and politician, into a figure full of paternal wisom and educational expertise, a remarkable parallel to what we find in the authorial persona of the *Disticha Catonis*. The connection of the *Disticha*, then, is resolutely with the Elder, rather than the Younger, Cato.

**Conclusion**

The collection of maxims known as the *Disticha Catonis* was broadly associated with Cato the Censor as its author, and with his son, Licinianus, as its addressee. These associations appear to have been part of the author's original conception of the work, and they were widely appreciated by later editors and readers, who enhanced the connection with further additions to the manuscript tradition. The *Disticha Catonis* thus points to the prominence of impressions of Cato as a perfect father and expert educator during this period, as the work seeks to capitalise upon a connection with the Censor and his son for its own didactic authority. The *Disticha*'s widespread popularity played a significant role in sealing this image as central for Cato's reception for centuries to come.

[202] See above p.211-2.

## 4.4 Conclusions

This section has considered the legacy left by Cato the Censor's educational policies, paternal imagery, and, above all, by the instructional works which he addressed to his son Licinianus for later writers of Latin didactic. While acknowledging the importance of the filial addressee for a wide range of technical prose treatises, this chapter has focussed particularly upon Cicero's *De officiis*, Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, and the anonymous *Disticha Catonis*, as works which readily engage with Cato's relationship with Licinianus and with the lasting impression of this left in his *Liber ad filium*. These works offer a remarkable refashioning of Cato the Censor into the figure of an educational expert. This image of Cato is used to lend authority to the didactic activities of the authors of these works at strategic points in their careers; to demonstrate the legitimacy of their subject matter, most notably providing credibility for the foreign, philosophical aspects of their teaching; and to confirm the correctness of their educational methodology – transferring the nostalgia surrounding paternal instruction into a clear curriculum leading to professional success. The prominence of Cato's *Liber ad filium* in these works demonstrates the continued importance of this aspect of Cato's public image, particularly under the changing political circumstances of the late Republic and early Empire; in this climate Cato's well-established educational interests really come to the fore, becoming the aspect of his career for which he was best remembered in the centuries to come.

# 5 Conclusion

This thesis has sought to shed light upon the written works which Marcus Porcius Cato addressed to his eldest son, Marcus Porcius Cato Licinianus, some time in the first quarter of the 2nd century BC. Although in a fragmentary state, and, in fact, all but written off by some critics, collectively these works – the *Historia*, *Liber ad filium*, and the *Epistulae* – add up to no small amount of text, particularly when taken as a portion of Cato's extant writings. These works share in much of the imagery which characterised Cato's public life and uphold many of the concerns which were central to his political career. The image of Cato created by these texts also became remarkably productive within received impressions of the Censor. These few fragmentary lines thus offer us significant potential to enhance our understanding of Cato the Censor, his life and times, and his legacy.

The edition which forms the first section of this thesis brings together all of the works which Cato addressed to Licinianus, translated into English and with a brief commentary, for the first time. The discussion ensuing from the edition suggests that these texts are best understood as documents which were practical in origin – notes used by the Censor in the training and instruction of his son – later revised and re-edited with an eye to wider circulation. This interpretation attributes a political significance to the works which helps to make sense of much of their style and content: read as a contribution to contemporary debate about education, the extreme views expressed here can be seen as part of Cato's immediate political strategy, offering the Censor a distinctive stance within the context of elite competition in this sphere; the longstanding address to Licinianus allows Cato to capitalise upon the popular appeal of paternal rhetoric; and the technical content, practical nature, and agricultural focus of the advice contained in these works contributes to Cato's censorial

imagery, attesting to his personal virtue and his public authority, in face of the difficulties he felt as one of Rome's earliest plebeian Censors. The work of later Latin authors also suggests something of the significance attached to the works which Cato addressed to Licinianus. The paternal address so prominent in these texts recurs widely in works of prose didactic, many of which directly invoke the image of the Censor in order to claim greater prestige for their authors as teachers and greater precedent for the topics that they treat as subjects suitable for instruction. Cato himself becomes, in the hands of authors such as Cicero, Varro, and the anonymous school teacher who compiled the *Disticha Catonis*, an expert educator and a perfect father; an image of the Censor which was likely based in his own rhetoric, and which left a lasting legacy for later ages. The works which Cato wrote for his son, then, certainly merit this study.

It is a fruitful moment to make suggestions for further research into the life and works of Cato the Censor. The recent publication of the long-awaited *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* and the anticipated publication of *The Fragments of the Republican Roman Orators* within the next few years will offer researchers a rich and detailed account of the majority of the extant fragments of Cato's writings. This account, to which the edition of this thesis adds the briefest of footnotes, will allow for further work on Cato's political strategy, as well as on his literary and cultural interests, offering the opportunity to clarify our picture of one of Rome's most influential writers and statesmen. In particular, a clearer picture of Cato will make an important contribution to our understanding of the interactions between the Rome and the rest of the Mediterranean during the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC. The literary evidence provided by Cato will supplement recent archaeological research in this area, offering a window onto important questions about shared elite culture and national identity. Following on specifically from the work of this thesis, the discussion of Cato as an

educator offered here raises questions about the role of education within Roman politics more widely. While of clear importance amidst the changing structures of the 2nd century BC, did education continue to be a sphere for competition in the late Republic and early Empire? If so, did the dynamics of this competition change, or remain the same? Is it possible to deduce the political importance of one's education in early Rome? This thesis also places us well to pose new questions about early didactic writing in Latin. What differences were felt between prose and poetry? What interaction was there between these different forms? How do the fragmentary works of the likes of Ennius and Lucilius contribute to the development of Latin didactic? How does this relate to Cato's contribution? When does prose didactic become felt to be a literary genre? How does this relate to the development of an equivalent poetic genre?

A final suggestion for further research is into the figure of the old man in Roman Comedy. Touched upon in the discussion of paternal imagery here, the old men of comedy are a remarkably rich and varied group, certainly deserving of further study. How do these figures relate to their Greek models? Do the different dramatists reproduce the same figures? Are their words and actions – either of nostalgia or of enthusiasm for modern values - connected to the rapid pace of change at Rome in recent years? How do these characters construct the past? Do these constructions, or their methods of construction, have any relevance for Roman historical writers? The research conducted into Cato's relationship with his son, and particularly into the works which the Censor addressed to the youth, thus provides a profitable basis for further research into the Catonian figures of contemporary comedy, the development of Latin didactic during the 2nd century BC, and the role played by education in Roman politics well beyond this period, as well as helping to enhance our understanding of this most remarkable epoch of Rome's history.

## Appendix: On Plutarch's *Life of Cato the Elder*

Much of the evidence for Cato's relationship with Licinianus made use of in this thesis has been taken from Plutarch's *Life of Cato the Elder*. Plutarch's biography gives a detailed description of Licinianus' upbringing - his infancy, early education, training at his father's hands, and his first stint of military service – as part of its description of Cato's personal life as the head of a private household. This evidence has provided essential context for the texts examined here and has lent valuable support to the case which this thesis makes for the importance placed upon this relationship, and the works associated with it, within Cato's public image, political career, and later reception. Indeed, on some points - the role of the Censor, for example, in his son's early education - Plutarch's account forms our only direct testimony to these claims. It is important, therefore, to consider the accuracy of Plutarch's account and the value of the evidence that he offers on these points.

In the past, scholars have emphasised Plutarch's extensive use and misuse of intermediary sources in composing his lives, criticising the vagaries and inaccuracies that this caused.[1] Some of these claims certainly hold true for the *Life of Cato Maior*. Plutarch appears to have inaccurately reported the date of Licinianus' death;[2] he makes use of Cicero's *De senectute* at several points within the work with little attention to the fictional nature of Cicero's character of Cato;[3] he recounts Cato's longstanding opposition to the Scipiones in a section which he has apparently taken from one of the annalists;[4] and his use of Nepos' biography of Cato, a

[1] The heyday of *Quellenforschung* saw scholars invent a host of biographies of Cato, both in Greek and Latin, as sources for Plutarch's work; see, for example, Smith (1940a), (1940b). Scardigli offers a convenient overview of scholarly opinion following in this tradition ((1979) 43-51, pp. 44-5).
[2] See above p.20 n.33.
[3] Plutarch notes his use of Cicero as a source at *Cat. Mai*. 17.5; the *De senectute* also lies behind Plutarch's account of Cato's time in Tarentum (*Cat. Mai*. 2.3-6) and his description of Cato's philosophical forbearance in the face of Licinianus' death (*Cat. Mai*. 24.10); it was likely a source for other sections of the biography, too.
[4] This analysis of the 2nd century BC in terms of party politics has all the hallmarks of the annalistic tradition. On the treatment of Cato at the hands of the annalists, see Della Corte (1969) 162-71.

detailed account which must have been useful for the *Life*, may well have led to further problems.[5] However, while Plutarch does use a range of secondary sources, which are certainly not limited to Cicero, Livy and the annalists, and Nepos, for his account of Cato, he does so with care and consideration. Plutarch compares the evidence of different accounts at particular points;[6] he carefully points out contradictions in the different traditions about Cato;[7] and his reliance upon sources such as Cicero – a diligent researcher and historian – for the early and late periods of Cato's life, for which there is far less primary evidence, is a natural choice. Overwhelmingly, though, Plutarch's biography is based upon his reading of Cato's own works, and these secondary sources simply supplement that material. Recent scholarship has stressed Plutarch's capabilities as a researcher and the care with which he read, and had his assistants read, a wide range of primary sources for his subjects.[8] This is particularly apparent in the case of the life of *Cato Maior* and there is significant support for the view that the biography forms a reliable source for Cato's life.

Several sections of Plutarch's biography can be traced directly to works written by Cato. Chapters eight and nine derive from a collection of the Censor's sayings, likely one with close connections to the *Apophthegmata* which Cato himself compiled, given the witty and whimsical nature of many of the quotations and the close parallels that they exhibit with the extant fragments of Cato's orations.[9] Plutarch's account of Cato's consulship is also derived from the Censor's own writings, with either the *De Consulatu Suo* or the *Origines* providing possible sources for the very positive account of his achievements in Spain.[10] Similarly,

[5] On Plutarch's consultation of Nepos' work, see Geiger (1981). On Nepos' 'feeble appetite for exactitude and primary sources', see Horsfall (1989) xviii.
[6] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 10.3, 12.5, 17.5.
[7] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 2.5-6.
[8] See Cornell (2013) 111-3 with ample bibliography given there.
[9] On the nature of Cato's *Apophthegmata* and its relationship to the variety of collections of the Censor's sayings which were compiled after his death, see above p.35-7.
[10] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 10.3-5 = F133 *FRHist.* with Cornell (2013) *ad loc.*

Cato's writings also acted as the source for Plutarch's description of Thermopylae: much of the detail of this narrative could only come from the commander's own account of the incident, the positive picture of Cato's conduct which emerges from it is also suggestive of its source, and there even appear to be verbal echoes of Cato's language to be found in the passage.[11] Plutarch also appears to have read widely within Cato's political speeches and he regularly works citations from these into his narrative.[12] The biographer has a good knowledge, too, of Cato's didactic works; his comments on the range and breadth of these and reveals a clear understanding of the *De agricultura*, in particular.[13] Notably, Plutarch draws his readers' attention to a series of quotations taken directly from Cato. In contrast to his recollection of Cato's words and sayings at other points of the narrative, which are typically announced with a simple 'he said' (ἐφη or ἔλεγε), Plutarch marks several quotations with the claim that 'Cato himself says' (φησιν αὐτος); this claim occurs seven times in the biography, and, at the majority of these points, the utterance can be closely paralleled with a passage of Cato's extant writings or with a known fact about the Censor.[14] Three of these claims fall in close succession: Cato's refusal to have his son educated by a slave, his composition of the *Historia*, and his concern for secure investment.[15] All of these statements have close connections with Cato's instruction of Licinianus, as does much of the surrounding content, which strongly suggests that Plutarch also had access to a collection of

[11] Plutarch recounts, for example, Cato's rationale for his decision to ascend the pass (*Cat. Mai.* 13.1); he describes how Cato's actions utterly terrified the enemy (*Cat. Mai.* 13.7) and directly recalls the boastful nature of his source (*Cat. Mai.* 14.2); Plutarch also makes use of the phrase, πιστοῖς... καὶ προθύμοις, to describe the band of soldiers which Cato gathered to himself: a phrase which would make an excellent translation of Cato's favourite formula for such situations, *boni atque strenui*; on this formula, see above p.79 n.256.

[12] The rhetoric of Cato's frugality found at Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 4.4-6, for example, echoes that featured in many of his speeches, but in the *De Sumptu Suo* (*ORF*[3] XLIV), in particular.

[13] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 25.2.

[14] (1-2) *Cat. Mai.* 1.1, 1.2: claims about the military achievements of Cato's father and the ancient virtue of his family, cf. *ORF*[3] 173; (3) *Cat. Mai.* 1.8: a claim about Cato's first term of military service, cf. *ORF*[3] XLVIII; (4) *Cat. Mai.* 10.3: a claim about the number of cities captured in Spain, cf. *ORF*[3] IV; (5-6) *Cat. Mai.* 20.6, 20.7: claims about Cato's refusal to have a slave educate his son and his composition of the *Historia* – these claims find no direct parallel, but have much in common with the general pattern of Cato's educational policy; (7) *Cat. Mai.* 21.5: a claim about Cato's concern for a secure investment, cf. *Agr. praef.* 4.

[15] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.6, 20.7, 21.5.

the works which the Censor addressed to his son, and that he was using this as his main source for this section of his biography.[16] The attribution of this section, and the comments within it on Cato's involvement in Licinianus' instruction, directly to a work or works of the Censor secures beyond reasonable doubt much of the evidence on which this thesis relies.

It is, of course, possible that Plutarch has expanded upon his source here. Such elaboration of circumstantial detail is not uncommon in the *Lives* and it would certainly not be out of place in this passage, which is rich in anecdotes that could well be furnished from memory and embellished by imagination.[17] This section has certainly been shaped by Plutarch's own interests in culture and in education.[18] Plutarch holds Cato's personal conduct as the head of his household and, in particular, his efforts in educating his son as the single most positive aspect of the Censor's character.[19] His admiration for Cato's achievements in this area is clear: Plutarch approves of Cato's dedication to the boy, he marvels at his ability to instruct his son in so many different disciplines, and he attributes the boy's virtue in battle to the fine education that he received from his father, a point to which he returns on several different occasions.[20] In particular, Plutarch paints a positive picture of Cato as a conduit for traditional Roman values and valour. The image of cultural purity, Plutarch's Cato grew up under no educational influences beyond the brave examples of his own father and grandfather; he successfully inculcates his son into this tradition of bravery, in spite of his physical

[16] Chapters 20-1 of Plutarch's biography recount Cato's family life, focussing upon his education of his son, and his household management. They are followed in chapters 23-4 by an account of Cato's reaction to Greek forms of art and education,which includes several direct quotations from the *Liber ad Filium*; see above on Fs 1-3. On the probability of this content deriving from the *Liber ad Filium*, see Sansone (1989) *ad loc.* On the existence of a collected edition of the works which Cato addressed to his son, see above p.145-6. If such a collection was known to, or indeed was the work of Cicero, it is highly likely that Plutarch also had access to it. On Plutarch's tendency to use a single major source in the composition of an individual *Life*, or a discreet section of a *Life*, see Jones (1971) 95-8.

[17] On Plutarch's embellishment of his source material with just the kind of circumstantial detail which we find in this section, see Pelling (1980) pp.129-30.

[18] On Plutarch's keen interest in his Roman subjects' engagement with Hellenic culture and Hellenised forms of education, see Swain (1989), (1990) and Pelling (1989).

[19] Plut. *Comp. Arist. et Cat. Mai.* 3.2.

[20] Cato's dedication: *Cat. Mai.* 20.4; his multidisciplinary training: *Cat. Mai.* 20.6; Licinianus' virtue as the fruit of his education: *Cat. Mai.* 20.12; *Aem.* 21.2.

weaknesses; and he leaves a further legacy of brave and worthy citizens in his descendants.[21] Indeed, it seems that Cato offers the best example of the sort of character produced by a non-Hellenised education: he and his offspring are full of a keen sense of honour, both on and off the battlefield.[22] Plutarch's own interests in this episode are thus clear. The case of Cato presents an interesting example of a devoted father, one dedicated to the education of his son, yet who did not display the same interest in Greek teachers or in Hellenised forms of instruction as his peers. The biography can be read as something of a study in the both the positive and negative aspects of such a traditional education.[23] It is possible, therefore, that Plutarch's own interests have elaborated and expanded this section of his *Life* of Cato, its importance deriving from the shape of the biographer's narrative, rather than from its significance within the Censor's own life.

This consideration of Plutarch's *Life of Cato Maior,* nonetheless, strongly suggests the reliability of his account and its viability as evidence for this thesis. While we should be aware of the possibilities of inaccuracy and elaboration, much of the material discussed here is carefully cited directly from Cato, whose writings are Plutarch's primary source for his work. The significant narrative function of the chapters describing Licinianus, and Plutarch's own interests in the boy's education, are clear. However, these chapters are closely connected to Cato's written works and to historical writings which treat the Censor. The shape which Plutarch's concerns give to this episode thus does not distort its value as evidence. On the whole, then, I believe we can be positive about the reliability of this section of Plutarch's

[21] The examples of Cato's father and grandfather: *Cat. Mai.* 1.1; Licinianus' physical limitations: *Cat. Mai.* 20.9; a legacy of noble descendants: *Comp. Arist. et Cat. Mai.* 3.5.

[22] While Cato's instruction in traditional Roman virtue creates a very brave son, Plutarch also holds that his adherence to traditional remedies and his resistance to the Greek art of medicine was responsible for the youth's early death, artfully making the Censor's greatest strength at once his most significant downfall. On Plutarch's probable exaggeration of Cato's opposition to Greek medicine here, see above p.69-72. On the biographer's tendency to frame his heroes greatest strengths as their greatest weaknesses, see Pelling (1989).

[23] The theme of teaching is also prominent in the *Life of Aristides*; see Sansone (1989) 12-4.

biography as a source and depend safely upon the evidence which it provides for Cato's relationship with Licinianus.

**Bibliography**


Adams, J. N. (2007) *The Regional Diversification of Latin, 200BC AD 600*, Cambridge.
(2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.

Allmand, C. (2011) *The 'De re militari' of Vegetius. The Reception, Transmission and Legacy of a Roman Text in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge.

Alston, R. (2008) 'History and Memory in the Construction of Identity in Early Second Century Rome' in S. Bell and I. L. Hansen (eds.), 'Role Models in the Roman World: Identity and Assimilation', *Memoirs of the American Acadamy in Rome* Suppl. Vol. 7, Ann Arbor, MI, 147-59.

Altman, J. G. (1982) *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form*, Columbus, OH.

Andrei, S. (1981) *Aspects du vocabulaire agricole latin*, Rome.

Astin, A. E. (1978) *Cato the Censor*, Oxford.
(1972) 'Cato Tusculanus and the Capitoline *Fasti*', *JRS* 62: 20-4.
(1967) *Scipio Aemilianus*, Oxford.

Austin, R. G. (1948) *Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber XII*, Oxford.

Badian, E. (1971) 'Ennius and his friends', in O. Skutsch (ed.), 'Ennius: sept exposés suivis de Discussions', *Fondation Hardt* 17: 149-208.

Barsby, J. (2001) *Terence*, Cambridge, MA.
(1986) *Plautus: Bacchides*, Warminster.

Barwick, K. (1948) 'Zu den Schriften des Cornelius Celsus und des alten Cato', *WJA* 3: 117-32.

Bernstein, N. W. (2008) 'Each Man's Father Served as his Teacher: Constructing Relatedness in Pliny's 'Letters'', *ClAnt*. 27: 203-30.

Berry, D. H. (2004) 'Literature and Persuasion in Cicero's *Pro Archia*', in J. Powell and J. Paterson (eds.), *Cicero the Advocate*, Oxford, 291-312.
(2000) *Cicero: Defence Speeches*, Oxford.

Bleckmann, B. (2002) *Die römischen Nobilität im Ersten Punischen Kreig: Untersuchungen zur aristokratischen Konkurrenz in der Republik*, Berlin.

Bloomer, M. W. (2011) *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education*, Berkeley, CA.
(1997) *Latinity and Literary Society at Rome*, Philadelphia, PA.

Blösel, W. (2000) 'Die Geschichte des Begriffes mos maiorum von den Anfängen bis zu

Cicero', in B. Linke and M. Stemmler (eds.). *Mos maiorum: Untersuchungen zu den Formen der Identitätsstiftung und Stabilisierung in der römischen Republik*, Stuttgart, 25-97.

Boas, M. (1934) *Die Epistola Catonis,* Amsterdam.
(1930) 'Woher stammt der Name Dionysius Cato?', *PhW* 649-656.
(1912) 'Der Codex Bosii der *Dicta Catonis*', *Rhein. Mus.* 67: 67-93.

Boas, M. & Botschuyver, H. J. (1952) *Disticha Catonis,* Amsterdam.

Bolisani, E. (1937) *I logistorici varroniani*, Padua.

Bonner, S. F. (1977) *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny,* London.

Boscherini, S. (1993) 'La medicina in Catone e Varrone', *ANRW* 2.37.1, 729-755.
(1970) *Lingua e scienza greca nel De agri cultura di Catone*, Rome.

Braund, S. H. (1988) *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*, Cambridge.

Brennan, T. C. (2000) *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, 2 vols., Oxford.

Broughton, T. R. S. and Patterson, M. L. (1951-60) *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, 2 vols., New York.

Briscoe, J. (2010) 'The Fragments of Cato's *Origines*', in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, Cambridge, 154-60.
(2005) 'The Language and Style of the Fragmentary Republican Historians', in T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, Oxford, 53-73.

Brunt, P. A. (1980) 'On historical fragments and epitomes', *CQ* 30: 477-94.
(1971) *Italian Manpower, 225 BC - AD 14*, Oxford.

Calboli, G. (1986) 'I modelli dell'archaismo: M. Porcio Catone', in *AIΩN (ling.)* 8: 37-69.
(1981) 'La retorica preciceroniana e la politica a Roma', in 'Éloquence et Rhétorique Chez Cicéron', *Foundation Hardt* 28: 41-108.
(1978) *Marci Porci Catonis Oratio pro Rhodiensibus: Catone, l'Oriente greco e gli imprenditori romani*, Bologna.
(1975) 'Cicerone, Catone e i Neoatticisti', in A. Michel and R. Verdière (eds.), *Ciceroniana: Hommages à Kazimierz Kumaniecki*, Leiden, 51-103.

Cancik, H. and Schneider, H. (2002-) *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World,* 15 vols., Leiden.

Cantarella, E. (2003) 'Fathers and Sons in Rome', *CW* 96: 281-98.

Cartier, M. (1996) 'China: The Family as a Relay of Government', in A. Burguière, C. Klapisch-Zuber, M. Segalen, and F. Zonablend (eds.), *A History of the Family: Distant Worlds, Ancient Worlds*, vol. 1, Cambridge, 491-522.

Ceaicovschi, K. R. (2008) *(Re)constructing Cato Maior: a literary assessment of the reception of Cato the Elder in the works of Cicero, Livy, and Aulus Gellius*, (Diss., University of Washington).

Chassignet, M. (1986) *Caton: Les Origines (fragments)*, Paris.

Clackson, J. and Horrocks, G. C. (2007) *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*, Oxford.

Coarelli F. (1972) 'Il sepolcro degli Scipioni', *DArch* 6: 36-106.

Coleman, R. (1990) 'Dialectal Variation in Republican Latin, with Special Reference to Praenestine', *PCPhS* 36: 1-25.

Compagnoni, G. and Berengo, G. M. (2014) *Opere di M. Porcio Catone, con traduzione e note*, 2nd edn., Rome.

Connolly, S. D. (2013) 'Binarism in the *Disticha Catonis*', *Mnemosyne* 66: 228-46.
(2012) '*Disticha Catonis Uticensis*', *CPh* 107: 119-30.

Cornell, T. J. (2013) *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, Oxford.
(2009) 'Cato the Elder and the Origins of Roman Autobiography', in C. J. Smith and A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography*, Swansea, 15-40.
(1996) 'Hannibal's legacy: the Effects of the Hannibalic War on Italy', in T. Cornell, B. Rankov and P. Sabin (eds.), *The Second Punic War: A Reappraisal*, London, 97-117.
(1995) *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000 – 264 BC)*, London.
(1972) *Cato's Origines and the Non-Roman Historical Tradition About Italy*, (Diss., University of London).

Costa, S (2013) *Quod olim fuerat: la rappresentazione del passato in Seneca prosatore*, Hildesheim.

Courtney, E. (1999) *Archaic Latin Prose*, Atlanta, GA.

Cribiore, R. (2001) *Gymnastics of the mind: Greek education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton, NJ.

Cugusi, P. (1992-2002) *Corpus epistularum latinarum papyris tabulis ostracis servatarum*, Florence.
(1994) *De Officiis Libro II con antologia dai libri I e III*, Milan.
(1991) 'Plauto e Catone' *BStudLat* 21: 291-305.
(1983) *Evoluzione e forme dell'epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell'impero, con cenni sull'epistolografia preciceroniana*, Rome.
(1970a) *Epistolographi Latini Minores*, vol. 1, Turin.
(1970b) 'Studi sull' epistolografia latina I: l'eta preciceroniana', *Annali delle Facoltà di lettere e filosofia e di magistero dell' Università di Cagliari*, 33: 7-112.

Cugusi, P. and Sblendorio Cugusi, M. T. (2001) *Opere di Marco Porcio Catone Censore*, Turin.

(1996) '*Problematica Catoniana*: Rassegna di studi 1978-1993 e contributi critici', *BStudLat* 26: 82-218.

Dahlmann, H. (1956) 'Catus oder Cato? Noch einmal der Titel von Varros *Logistoricus*', in *Navicula Chroniensis. Studia Philologica F. Jacoby professori Chiloniensi emerito octogenario oblata*, Leiden, 114-22.

Dalby, A. (1998) *On farming: De agricultura*, Totnes.

Dasen, V. and Späth, T. (2010) *Children, Memory, and Family Identity in Roman Culture*, Oxford.

de Melo, W. D. C. (2011-3) *Plautus*, 5 vols., Cambridge, MA.

(2007) *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond*, Oxford.

de Meo, C. (1983) *Le Lingue techniche del Latino*, Bologna.

Della Corte, F. (1969) *Catone Censore: La vita e la fortuna*, 2nd edn., Florence.

(1946) *Enciclopisti Latini*, Genoa.

(1941) 'Catone Maggiore e i 'libri ad Marcum filium'', *RFIC* 19: 81-96.

Dench, E. (1995) *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of the Peoples from the Central Apennines*, Oxford.

Dickey, E. (2002) *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*, Oxford.

Dillery, J. (2009) 'Roman Historians and the Greeks: Audiences and Models', in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 77-107.

Dixon, S. (1992) *The Roman Family*, Baltimore, MD.

Dominik, W. J. (1997) *Roman Eloqunce: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, London.

Dorey, T. A. (1966) *Latin Historians*, London.

Duckworth, G. E. (1952) *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*, Princeton, NJ.

Dugan, J. (2005) *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*, Oxford.

Dyck, A. R. (1996) *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*, Ann Arbor, MI.

Enk, P. J. (1953) *Plauti Truculentus: cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentario exegetico*, 2 vols., Leiden.

Fantham, E. (1996) *Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore, MD.
(1972) *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*, Toronto.

Feeney, D. (2010) 'Fathers and Sons: the Manlii Torquati and Family Continuity in Catullus and Horace', in C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola, C. B. R. Pelling, and A. J. Woodman (eds.), *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman*, Oxford, 205-22.
(2005) 'The Beginnings of a Literature in Latin', *JRS* 95: 226-40.

Fink, R. O. (1971) *Roman Military Records on Papyrus*, Cleveland, OH.

Fitzgerald W. H. (1969) 'Quintilian's portrait of the teacher', *CF* 23: 238-245.

Flower, H. I. (2009a) *Roman Republics*, Princeton, NJ.
(2009b) 'Alternatives to Written History in Republican Rome', in A. Feldherr (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 65-76.
(1996) *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford.

Fraenkel, E. (2007) *Plautine Elements in Plautus*, Oxford.

Frier, B. W. (1999) *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: the Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*, Ann Arbor, MI.

Gabba, E. (1989) 'Rome and Italy in the 2nd Century BC', in A. E. Astin, F. W. Walbank, M. W. Frederiksen and R. M. Ogilvie (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient History*, vol. 8, Cambridge, 197-243.
(1988) *Del buon uso della richezza*, Milan.

Garbarino, G. (1973) *Roma e la filosofia greca dalle origini alla fine dell secolo II a.c.*, 2 vols., Turin.

Geiger, J. (1988) 'Nepos and Plutarch. From Latin to Greek Political Biography', *ICS* 13: 245-56.
(1981) 'Plutarch's Parallel Lives; The Choice of Heroes', *Hermes* 109: 85-104.

Gerosa, M. (1910) *La prima enciclopedia romana. I 'libri ad Marcum filium di Catone Censore*, Pavia.

Gibson, R. K. (2012) 'On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections', *JRS* 102: 56-78.

Gildenhard, I. (2007) '*Paideia Romana*: Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*', *PCPhS* Suppl. Vol. 30, Cambridge.
(2003) 'The 'annalist' before the annalists: Ennius and his *Annales*', in U. Eigler (ed.), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*, Darmstadt, 93-114.

Goldberg, S. M. (2009) 'The Faces of Eloquence: The *Dialogus de Oratoribus*', in A. J. Woodman (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, Cambridge, 73-84.
(2005) *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and its Reception*, Cambridge.

(1995) *Epic in Republican Rome*, Oxford.
(1986) *Understanding Terence*, Princeton, NJ.
(1983) 'Terence, Cato and the Rhetorical Prologue', *CPh* 78: 198-211.

Gotter, U. (2009) 'Cato's *Origines*: The Historian and his Enemies', in A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge, 108-22.

Goujard, R. (1975) *Caton: De L'Agriculture*, Paris.

Gowers, E. (2012) *Horace: Satires Book One*, Cambridge.

Granatelli, R. (2001) 'Traduzione', in A. Pennacini (ed.), *Quintiliano, Institutio Oratoria*, 2 vols., Turin, 156-279.

Gratwick, A. S. (2002) 'A Matter of Substance: Cato's Preface to the *De agricultura*', *Mnemosyne* 55: 41-72.
(1993) Plautus: *Menaechmi*, Cambridge.
(1991) 'Catullus 1.10 and the Title of his 'libellus'', *G&R* 38: 199-202.
(1987) Terence: *The Brothers*, Warminster.
(1982) 'Drama' and 'Prose Literature' in E. J. Kenney (ed.), *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 2, Cambridge, 77-137 and 138-155.

Greenblatt, S. (1980) *Renaissance Self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, Chicago, IL.

Griffin, J. (1985) *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, London.

Griffin, M. T. and Atkins, E. M. (1991) *Cicero: On Duties*, Cambridge.

Griffiths, M. (2006b) 'Horsepower and Donkeywork: Equids and the Ancient Greek Imagination: Part Two', *CPh* 101: 307-58.
(2006a) 'Horsepower and Donkeywork: Equids and the Ancient Greek Imagination: Part One', *CPh* 101: 185-246.

Grimal, P. (1965-6) 'Encyclopédies antiques', *CHM* 9: 459-82.

Gruen, E. S. (2011) *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*, Princeton, NJ.
(1992) *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, Ithaca, NY.
(1990) *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*, Leiden.
(1984) *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, Berkeley, CA.

Guarino A. (1987) 'Catone giureconsulto', *Index* 15: 41-49.
(1985) *Iusculum Iuris*, Naples.

Habinek, T. (1998) *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity and Empire in Ancient Rome*, Princeton, NJ.
(1987) 'Greeks and Romans in Book 12 of Quintilian', *Ramus* 16: 192-202.

Hall, E. (1994) 'Drowning by Nomes: The Greeks, Swimming, and Timotheus' Persians', in H. A. Khan (ed.), *The Birth of the European Identity: the Europe-Asia Contrast in Greek Thought 490-332BC*, Nottingham, 44-80.

Hanssen, J. (1951) *Latin Diminutives: A Semantic Study*, Bergen.

Häussler, R. (1968) *Nachträge zu A. Otto Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer*, Darmstadt.

Harris, W. V. (1989) *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge, MA.
(1986) 'A Roman Father's Power of Life and Death', in W. V. Harris & R. S. Bagnall (eds.), *Studies in Roman Law in Memory of A. Arthur Schiller*, Leiden, 81-95.
(1979) *War and Imperialiasm in Republican Rome, 327-70 BC*, Oxford.

Helm, R. W. O. (1929) *Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik und ihr Wert für die Literaturgeschichte*, Mainz.

Hinds, S. (2004) 'Petrarch, Cicero, Virgil: Virtual Community in *Familiares* 24.4', in G.W. Most and S. Spence (eds.), 'Re-Presenting Virgil: Special Issue in Honour of Michael C. J. Putnam', *MD* 52: 157-75.
(2001) 'Immanent Literary History in the Cultural Economy', *Foundation Hardt* 47: 221-57.
(1998) *Allusion and Intertext: the Dynamics of Appropriation in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge.

Hobsbawm, E. J. and Ranger, T. O. (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge.

Holford-Strevens, L. (2003) *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*, Oxford.

Hölkeskamp, K. J. (2011) 'Self-Serving Sermons: Oratory and the Self-Construction of the Republican Aristocrat', in C. Smith and R. Covino (eds.), *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric*, Swansea, 17-34.
(2004) *Senatus Populusque Romanus: Die politische Kultur der Republik: Dimensionen und Deutungen*, Stuttgart.
(1993) 'Conquest, Competition, and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the *Nobilitas*', *Historia* 42: 12-39.

Horsfall, N. (2003) *The Culture of the Roman Plebs*, London.
(1995) 'Cato, Cicero and the *Georgics*: a note', *Vergilius* 41: 55-56.
(1989) *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*, Oxford.

Imber, M. (2008) 'Life without father: Declamation and the Construction of Paternity in the Roman Empire', in S. Bell and I. L. Hansen (eds.), 'Role Models in the Roman World: Identity and Assimilation', *Memoirs of the American Acadamy in Rome* Suppl. Vol. 7, Ann Arbor, MI, 161-9.

Jahn, O. (1850) 'Über römische Encyclopädien', *BSG* 2: 263-72.

Janson, T. (1964) *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*, Stockholm.

Jefferson, E. (2012) 'Problems and audience in Cato's *Origines*' in S. T. Roselaar (ed.),

'Processes of Integration and Identity Formation in the Roman Republic', *Mnemosyne* Suppl. Vol. 342, Leiden, 311-26.

Jones, C. P. (1971) *Plutarch and Rome,* Oxford.

Jones, W. H. S. (1963) *Pliny: Natural History*, 10 vols., Cambridge, MA.

Jordan, H. (1860) *M. Catonis praeter librum de re rustica quae extant*, Leipzig.

Kaster, R. A. (1988) *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity,* Berkley, CA.

Kennedy, G. A. (1972) *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 BC - AD 300,* Princeton, NJ.

Kienast, D. (1954) *Cato der Zensor: seine Persönlichkeit und seine Zeit,* Heidelberg.

Kondratieff, E. (2004) 'The Column of Duilius: Innovations in Iconography in Large and Small Media in the Middle Republic', *SCI* 23:1-39.

Krenkel, W. (1959) 'Zu den Artes des Celsus', *Philologus* 103: 114-129.

Kronenberg, L. (2009) *Allegories of Farming from Greece and Rome: Philosophical Satire in Xenophon, Varro and Virgil,* Cambridge.

Lana, I. (1947) 'Terenzio e il movimento filellenico in Roma', *RFIC* 25: 44-80 and 155-75.

La Penna, A. (1987) 'Rapere, trahere: uno slogan di Catone contro i ladri di stato?' *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a Francesco Della Corte*, Vol. 2, Urbino, 103-10.

Leeman, A. D. (1963) *Orationis Ratio: Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers,* Amsterdam.

Leeman, A. D., Pinkster, H., Nelson, H. L. W. (1985) *M. T. Cicero: De Oratore Libri III, 2. Band: Buch 1.166 – Buch 2.98,* Heidelberg.

Lefèvre, E. (1990) 'Politik and Gesellschaft in Plautus' *Trinummus*', in J. Bländsdorf (ed.), *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum,* Tübingen, 45-54.

Lefkowitz, M. R. and Fant, M. B. (1982) *Women's Life in Greece and Rome,* 3rd edn., London.

Leigh, M. (2013) *From Polypragmon to Curiosus: Ancient Concepts of Curious and Meddlesome Behaviour,* Oxford.

(2010) 'Early Roman Epic and the Maritime Moment', *CPh* 105: 265-80.

(2004a) *Comedy and the Rise of Rome,* Oxford.

(2004b) 'Quintilian on the Emotions (*Institutio Oratoria* 6 Preface and 1-2)', *JRS* 94: 122-40.

(1997) *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement,* Oxford.

(1995) 'Wounding and Popular Rhetoric at Rome', *BICS* 40: 195-216.

LeMoine, F. J. (1991) 'Parental Gifts: Father-Son Dedications and Dialogues in Roman Didactic Literature', *ICS* 16: 337-66.

Lentano, M. (1993) 'Parce ac duriter: Catone, Plauto e una formula felice', *Maia* 45: 11-16.

Leo, F. (1913) *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Berlin.

Letta, C. (1984) 'L'Italia dei mores Romani nelle *Origines* di Catone', *Athenaeum* 62: 3-30, 416-439.

Lewis, R. G. (1993) 'Imperial autobiography: Augustus to Hadrian', *ANRW* 2.34.1: 629-706.
(1991) 'Suetonius' 'Caesares' and their literary antecedants', *ANRW* 2.33.5: 3623-3674.

Lindsay, W. M. (1930-1) *Glossaria latina*, vol. IV-V, Paris.

Lightfoot, J. (1999) *Parthenius: The Poetical Fragments and the 'Erotica Pathemata'*, Oxford.

Lindsay, H. (2009) *Adoption in the Roman World*, Cambridge.

Lodge, G. (1904-1933) *Lexicon Plautinum*, Leipzig.

Lushkov, H. A. (2015) *Magistracy and the Historiography of the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.

MacKendrick, P. (1954) 'Demetrius of Phalerum, Cato, and the *Adelphoe*', *RFIC* 32: 18-35.

Malcovati, E. (1953) *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta Liberae Rei Publicae*, 3rd edition, Turin.

Maltby, R. (1991) *A Lexicon of Latin Etymologies*, Leeds.

Marcucci, S. (2001) *Cato: sull' educazione dei figli*, Parma.

Mariotti, S. (1952) *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica*, Milan.

Marmorale, E. (1949) *Cato Maior*, 2nd edn., Bari.

Marrou, H. I. (1956) *A History of Education in Antiquity*, London.

Martin, R. H. (1976) *Terence: Adelphoe*, Cambridge.

May, J. (1990) 'The Monologistic Dialogue as a Method of Literary Criticism: Cicero, *Brutus* 285-289 and Horace, *Epistle* 2.1.34-39', *Athenaeum* 68: 177-80.

Mayer, R. (2001) *Tacitus: Dialogus de Oratoribus*, Cambridge.
(1994) *Horace: Epistles Book One*, Cambridge.

Mazzarino, A. (1952) *Introduzione al De agri cultura di Catone*, Rome.

McDonald, I. R. (1975) 'The *vir bonus* and Quintilian XI,3', *SPh* 72: 237-45.

McDonnell M. (2006) *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.

McGlynn, P. (1963-7) *Lexicon Terentianum*, London.

Mercklin, A. (1849) 'Die isagogischen schriften der Römer', *Philologus* 4: 413-29.

Millar, F. (1986) 'Politics, Persuasion and the People before the Social War (150-90 BC)', *JRS* 76: 1-11.
(1984) 'The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic, 200-151 BC', *JRS* 74: 1-19.

Mitsis, P. (2003) 'Stoicism', in C. Shields (ed.), *The Blackwell Guide to Ancient Philosophy*, Oxford, 253-67.

Morello, R. and Morrison, A.D. (2007) *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, Oxford.

Moretti, G. (1995) *Acutum genus dicendi: Brevita, oscurita, sottigliezze e paradossi nelle tradizioni retoriche degli Stoici*, Bologna.

Morgan, T. (1998) *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge.

Muller, F. (1930) 'Festi locum corruptum sanare conatur', *Mnemosyne* 58: 437-40.

Müller, R. (1938) *Varro Logistoricus über Kindererziehung*, Bonn.

Münscher, K. (1920) 'Xenophon in der griechische-römischen Literatur', *Philologus* Suppl. 13., Vol. 2, 1-243, Leipzig.

Musti, D (1985) 'I due volti della Sabina', *DArch* 2: 77-86.

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Rudd, N. (2004) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*, Oxford.

Oakley, S. P. (1997-2005) *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI-X*, 4 vols., Oxford.

Ogilvie, R. M. (1965) *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*, Oxford.

Oniga, R. (1998) 'Struttura e funzione dei cantica nell' *Amphitruo*' in R. Raffaelli and A. Tontini (eds.), *Amphitruo*, Urbino, 31-47.

Ortoleva, V. (1992) *Maximus Planudes: Disticha Catonis in Graecum Translata*, Rome.

Otto, A. (1890) *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig.

Palmer, L. R. (1954) *The Latin Language*, London.

Papanghelis, T. D., Harrison, S. J., and Frangoulidis, S. A. (2013) *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*, Berlin.

Parkin, T. G. (2003) *Old Age in the Roman World: A Cultural and Social History*, Baltimore, MD.

Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., and Kroll, W. (1894-) *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart.

Pease, A. S. (1926) 'Things Without Honour', *CPh* 21: 27-42.

Pelling, C. B. R. (1989) 'Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture', in M. Griffin and J. Barnes (eds.), *Phiosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*, Oxford, 199-232.

(1980) 'Plutarch's Adaptation of his Source-Material', *JHS* 100: 127-39.

(1979) 'Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives', *JHS* 99: 74-96.

Penney, J. H. W. (2005) 'Connections in Archaic Latin Prose', in T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, and J. N. Adams (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, Oxford, 37-51.

Pernot, L. (1993) *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*, Paris.

Peter, H. (1914) *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, 2 vols., Leipzig.

Pitcher, L. (2009) *Writing Ancient History: An Introduction to Classical Historiography*, London.

Pittenger, M. R. P. (2008) *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome*, Berkley, CA.

Powell, J. G. F. (1995) *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford.

(1988) *Cato Maior De Senectute*, Cambridge.

Powell, O. (2003) *Galen: On the Properties of Foodstuffs (De Alimentorum Facultatibus)*, Cambridge.

Prag, J. and Quinn, J. (2013) *The Hellenistic West: Rethinking the Ancient Mediterranean*, Cambridge.

Purcell, N. (1995) 'The Roman villa and the landscape of production', in T. J. Cornell and K. Lomas (eds.), *Urban Society in Roman Italy*, London, 151-80.

Putnam, M. (1979) *Virgil's Poem of the Earth*, Princeton, NJ.

Rawson, B. (2003) *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy*, Oxford.

(1986) *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, London.

Rawson, E. (1991) *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*, Oxford.

(1985) *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London.

(1975) *Cicero: A Portrait*, London.
(1972) 'Cicero the Historian and Cicero the Antiquarian', *JRS* 62: 33-45.

Reay, B. (2012) 'Cato's *De agri cultura* and the Spectacle of Expertise', in J. A. Becker and N. Terrenato (eds.), *Roman Republican Villas: Architecture, Context, Ideology*, Ann Arbor, MI, 61-8.
(2005) 'Agriculture, Writing and Cato's Aristocratic Self-fashioning', *ClAnt* 24: 331-61.

Reinhardt, T. and Winterbottom, M. (2006) *Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, Book 2*, Oxford.

Ruebel J. S. (1972) *The Political Development of Cato Censorius: The Man and the Image*, (Diss., University of Cincinnati).

Reynolds, L. D. and Wilson, N. G. (1991) *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd edn., Oxford.

Ribbeck, J. K. O. (1897-8) *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, 3rd edn., 2 vols., Leipzig.

Roos, P. (1984) *Sentenza e proverbio nell' antichità e i 'Distici di Catone'*, Brescia.

Roselaar, S. T. (2010) *Public Land in the Roman Republic: A Social and Economic History of ager publicus in Italy*, 396-89 BC, Oxford.

Rosenstein, N. (1993) 'Competition and Crisis in Mid-Republican Rome', *Phoenix* 47: 313-38.

Rosenstein, N. and Morstein-Marx, R. (2007) *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, Chichester.

Rüpke, J. (2006) 'Ennius's *Fasti* in Fulvius's temple: Greek rationality and Roman tradition', *Arethusa* 39: 489-512.

Russell, D. A. (2001) *Quintilian: The Orator's Education*, 5 vols., Cambridge, MA.

Saller, R. (1986) '*Patria potestas* and the Stereotype of the Roman Family', *Continuity and Change* 1: 7-22.

Sansone, D. (1989) *Plutarch: Lives, Aristeides and Cato*, Warminster.

Scarborough, J. (1969) *Roman Medicine*, Ithaca, NY.

Scardigli, B. (1979) *Die Römerbiographien Plutarchs*, Munich.

Schlegel, C. M. (2000) 'Horace and his Fathers: *Satires* 1,4 and 1,6', *AJPh* 121: 93-119.

Schönberger, O. (1969) 'Versuch der Gewinnung eines Catos-fragmentes, *Philologus* 113: 283-7.
(1980) *Marcus Porcius Cato, Vom Landbau, Fragmente, alle erhaltenen*

*Schriften*, Munich.

Schmeling, G. (2011) *A Commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius*, Oxford.

Schmidt, P. L. (1972) 'Catos '*Epistula ad M. filium*' und die Anfänge der römischen Briefliteratur', *Hermes* 100: 568-76.

Sciarrino, E. (2011) *Cato the Censor and the Beginnings of Latin Prose*, Columbus, OH.
(2006) 'The Introduction of Epic in Rome: Cultural Thefts and Social Contests', *Arethusa* 39: 449-69.
(2004) 'Putting Cato the Censor's *Origines* in its Place', *ClAnt* 23: 323-57.

Segal, E. (1968) *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus*, Cambridge, MA.

Shackleton-Bailey, D. R. (1980) *Select Letters*, Cambridge.
(1965-8) *Letters to Atticus*, 4 vols., Cambridge.

Sherwin-White, A. N. (1966) *The Letters of Pliny*, Oxford.

Slater, N. W. (2010) 'Opening Negotiations: the Work of the Prologue to Plautus' *Mercator*', *NECJ* 37: 5-13.

Smith, R. E. (1940a) 'Plutarch's Biographical Sources in the Roman Lives', *CQ* 34: 1-10.
(1940b) 'The *Cato Censorius* of Plutarch', *CQ* 34: 105-12.

Speranza, F. (1974) *Scriptorum Romanorum de Re Rustica Reliquiae*, Rome.

Steele, C. (2006) 'Roman Oratory', *G&R, New Surveys in the Classics 36*, Cambridge.
(2005) *Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome*, London.

Steinby, E. M. (1993-2000) *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*, 6 vols., Rome.

Stevenson, T. R. (1992) 'The Ideal Benefactor and the Father Analogy in Greek and Roman Thought', *CQ* 42: 421-36.

Stuart, D. S. (1928) *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, Berkeley, CA

Suerbaum, W. (2004) *Cato Censorius in der Forschung des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Hildesheim.

Suerbaum, W. and Blänsdorf, J. (2002) *Die archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod*, Munich.

Suolahti, J. (1963) *The Roman Censors: A Study on Social Structure*, Helsinki.

Süss, W. (1965) *Eine Einführung in seine philosophischen Schriften*, Wiesbaden.

Swain, S. C. R. (1990) 'Hellenic Culture and the Roman Heroes of Plutarch', *JHS* 110: 126-45.
(1989) 'Plutarch's *Aemilius* and *Timoleon*', *Historia* 38: 314-34.

Terrenato, N (2012) 'The Enigma of 'Catonian Villas' in J. A. Becker and N. Terrenato (eds.), *Roman Republican Villas: Architecture, Context, Ideology*, Ann Arbor, MI, 69-93.

Thesleff, H. (1965) *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*, Turku.

Till, R. (1976) *Res publica: Texte zur Krise der frührömischen Tradition*, Zurich.
(1935) 'Die Sprache Catos', *Philologus* Suppl. 28, Vol. 2, 1-102.

Toohey, S. (1999) 'Beliefs, values and ideologies in course design', in S. Toohey (ed.), *Designing Courses for Higher Education*, Buckingham, 44-69.

Toynbee, A. J. (1965) *Hannibal's Legacy: The Hannibalic War's Effects on Roman Life*, 2 vols., London.

Trapp, M. B. (2003) *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology, with Translation*, Cambridge.

Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. (1957) 'Une comédie de Térence jouée aux funérailles de L. Aemilius Paullus', *AAntHung* 5: 129-67.

Van der Blom, H. (2010) *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*, Oxford.

Vogt-Spira, G. (2000) ''The Pervasive Inconsequence of all Morality': the Example of Cato the Elder', in K. Pollmann (ed.), *Double Standards in the Ancient and Medieval World*, Göttingen, 107-19.

Volk, K. (2002) *The Poetics of Latin Didactic*, Oxford.

Von Staden, H. (1996) 'Liminal Perils. Early Roman Receptions of Greek Medicine', in F. J. Ragep and S. P. Ragep, with S. Livesey (eds.), *Tradition, Transmission, Transformation: Proceedings of two conferences on pre-modern science held at the university of Oklahoma*, Leiden, 369-418.

Walbank, F. W. (1957-79) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols., Oxford.

Wallace, R. E. (2011) 'The Latin Alphabet and Orthography', in J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin language*, Chichester, 9-28

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (2008) *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge.
(1998) 'The villa as a cultural symbol', in A. Frazer (ed.), *The Roman Villa*, Philadelphia, PA, 43-54.

Walzer, A. E. (2003) 'Quintilian's *vir bonus* and the Stoic Wise Man', *RSQ* 33: 25-41.

Wardle, D. (2014) *Suetonius: Life of Augustus*, Oxford.

Wehrli, F. (1936) *Motivstudien zur Griechischen Komödie*, Zurich and Leipzig.

White, K. D. (1973) 'Roman agricultural writers I: Varro and his predecessors', *ANRW* 1.4: 439-97.
(1970) *Roman Farming*, Ithaca, NY.
(1967) '*Latifundia*', *BICS* 14: 62-79.

Wilkins, A. S. (1892) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Oratore*, Oxford.

Wilkins, J. (2003) 'Land and Sea: Italy and the Mediterranean in the Discourse of Dining', *AJPh* 124: 359-75.

Wilms, J. N. (1843) *M. Porci Catonis Vita et Fragmenta*, 2nd edn., Dortmund.

Winsbury, R. (2009) *The Roman Book*, London.

Windsor Leach, E. (1971) 'Horace's *Pater Optimus* and Terence's Demea: Autobiographical Fiction and Comedy in *Sermo*, I, 4', *AJPh* 92: 616-32.

Winterbottom, M. (1998) 'Quintilian the Moralist', in T. Albaladejo, E. del Río, and J. A. Caballero (eds.), *Quintiliano: historia y actualidad de la retórica*, 3 vols., Calahorra, 317-334.
(1994) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Officiis*, Oxford.
(1984) *The Minor Declamations Ascribed to Quintilian*, Berlin.
(1964) 'Quintilian and the *vir bonus*', *JRS* 54: 90-7.

Wiseman, T. P. (1979) *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*, Leicester.
(1971) *New Men in the Roman Senate*, London.

Woytek, E. (1982) 'Zur Herkunft der Arztszene in den *Menaechmi* des Plautus', *WS* 16: 165-82.

Wulfram, H. (2009) *Ex uno plures: drei Studien zum postumen Persönlichkeitsbild des Alten Cato*, Berlin.

Zetzel, J. E. G. (1995) *De Re Publica: Selections*, Cambridge.

Zucchelli, B (1981) *Varro logistoricus: studio letterario e prosopografico*, Parma.