



<https://publications.dainst.org>

# iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

## F. X. Ryan Tullus or Tullius?

aus / from

### Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **24 • 1994**

Seite / Page **75–82**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1065/5432> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1994-24-p75-82-v5432.8

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

**©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://dainst.org)

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

F. X. RYAN

## Tullus or Tullius?

Not long after Caesar uttered the words ἀνεροίφθω κύβος (Plut. Pomp. 60,4, App. BC 2,35), a certain senator proposed that an embassy be sent to him. According to Plutarch (Pomp. 60,6), the senator who made this motion was Τύλλος; according to Appian (BC 2,36), Κικέρων.<sup>1</sup> It is at once apparent that L. Volcaci<sup>us</sup> Tullus has been confounded with M. Tullius Cicero, but it is not immediately clear whether the mistake is that of Plutarch or that of Appian. The extant evidence is sufficient to enable us to resolve this dispute. That resolution will affect our estimate of Plutarch and Appian on the one hand, and of Volcaci<sup>us</sup> and Cicero on the other.

Both Appian and Plutarch have had their defenders. In the discussions of historians Appian's reputation has suffered more than Plutarch's. One can maintain that Cicero authored the motion without attacking the historicity of Plutarch's account: since his text reads Τύλλος, it is possible to argue that Plutarch himself wrote Τύλλιος, and that Τύλλος is an error of textual transmission. But one cannot attribute the motion to Volcaci<sup>us</sup> without faulting Appian, since his text reads Κικέρων; Appian is then either responsible for the confusion himself, or guilty of uncritically accepting a source which already contained the error.

Attempts have been made to resolve the contradiction without impeaching the reliability of either Plutarch or Appian. L. HOLZAPFEL offered the solution outlined above, that Plutarch actually wrote Τύλλιος.<sup>2</sup> But in the preceding chapter

---

<sup>1</sup> Neither Plutarch nor Appian report the fate of the motion, though Appian (BC 2,37) reveals that the consuls opposed it. We know that Pompey on at least one occasion opposed the sending of an embassy to Caesar (Caes. BC 1,32,8). Since neither L. Caesar nor L. Roscius was sent to Caesar by the senate (D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, JRS 50, 1960, 83) it seems likely enough that Pompey spoke in opposition to the motion of Tullus/Tullius (so L. HOLZAPFEL, Die Anfänge des Bürgerkrieges zwischen Cäsar und Pompejus, Klio 3, 1903, 229). HOLZAPFEL believed that the motion was passed, and that L. Caesar and L. Roscius were now sent to Caesar a second time. But the second embassy which Dio (41,5,4) attributes to L. Caesar and Roscius «is generally agreed to be a blunder» (SHACKLETON BAILEY, 82). On the strength of the opposition of the consuls and Pompey, ED. MEYER stated plainly that «der Antrag... auf Friedensverhandlungen wurde abgelehnt» (Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus<sup>3</sup>, Stuttgart and Berlin 1922, 296). In view of the opposition it aroused, we can be fairly confident that the motion was not even submitted to a vote – the *pronuntiatio sententiarum* at this meeting would have been undertaken by one of the consuls.

<sup>2</sup> HOLZAPFEL, l. c. 229 n. 1. Though she does not comment on the conflicting accounts of

(Pomp. 59,5) Plutarch identifies Cicero solely by his cognomen, Κικέρων. In this Life Plutarch never once identifies Cicero with Τύλλιος, but always with Κικέρων.<sup>3</sup> It is therefore impossible to believe that Plutarch wrote Τύλλιος in our passage, and that his text has become corrupted.<sup>4</sup> A second attempt to save the historicity of both authors was made by T. RICE HOLMES: «If, as Plutarch says, Volcaci<sup>us</sup> Tullus proposed to send envoys to treat for peace, that does not prove that Cicero did not make the same suggestion.»<sup>5</sup> But it is clear that Appian and Plutarch are describing the same senate meeting;<sup>6</sup> both represent the meeting as the senate's reaction to the news that Caesar had crossed the Rubicon, and both report a witticism of Favonius after recording the motion for an embassy. The fact that Plutarch and Appian are narrating the same meeting is significant, for senate procedure did not permit two senators at the same meeting to propose the same motion. The Romans made the senator who proposed a motion the grammatical subject of the phrase *sententiam dicere*; a senator who held the same opinion was made the subject of *verbo adsentiri* or *pedibus in sententiam ire*, in accordance with the means he used to indicate his agreement.<sup>7</sup> A senator who spoke at length in favor of the motion of another might be made the subject of *sententiam dicere*, but he would not be represented in a Latin source as the author of the proposal.<sup>8</sup> This second attempt to defend both Plutarch and Appian must fail. Plutarch portrays Volcaci<sup>us</sup> as the author of a motion, and Appian portrays Cicero as the author of the same motion. The accounts are not compatible, since the Romans never considered one proposal to have two authors.<sup>9</sup>

---

Plutarch and Appian, M. BONNEFOND-COUDRY, *Le Sénat de la République romaine de la guerre d'Hannibal à Auguste*, Rome 1989, 629, also believes that the motion was made by Cicero.

<sup>3</sup> Plut. Pomp. 42,13; 46,8,9; 48,9; 49,1,4,6; 59,5; 63,2; 64,6. Not even in the Life of Cicero did Plutarch refer to Cicero as Τύλλιος. In the whole Life the nomen occurs just once, and then in conjunction with his praenomen (Plut. Cic. 1,6); the passage serves simply to record his first two names.

<sup>4</sup> The reading Τύλλιος is retained by K. ZIEGLER (Leipzig 1973) and by R. FLACELIÈRE and E. CHAMBRY (Paris 1973).

<sup>5</sup> *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire*, Oxford 1923, III 3 n. 4.

<sup>6</sup> HOLZAPFEL, l. c. (n. 1) 228, considered it self-evident that Appian and Plutarch used the same source.

<sup>7</sup> These three ways of participating in debate are elucidated at Liv. 27,34,6–7, a passage rightly understood by D. B. MONRO, *Journal of Philology* 4, 1872, 117, and by P. WILLEMS, *Le Sénat de la République romaine*, Louvain 1883, II 188 n. 5.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Prov. cons.* 1, where Cicero commences a lengthy speech in favor of the motion of P. Servilius Vatia: *si princeps eam sententiam dicerem*, where *ea* may be contrasted with *in meam sententiam*, the formula Cicero uses to report the passage of decrees which he proposed (Att. 4,1,6; Fam. 1,9,9; 9,15,4).

<sup>9</sup> Two men could perhaps jointly author a decree (in contradistinction to a motion), inasmuch as the presiding officer might put an amended *sententia* to the vote. But we know of no difference in the *sententiae* attributed to Volcaci<sup>us</sup> and Cicero, and we have already determined that no *discessio* took place.

With his better understanding of senate procedure, L. LANGE attributed the motion to Volcaci<sup>us</sup>, and a speech in support of the motion to Cicero.<sup>10</sup> While this solution is in line with rules of procedure, it ignores the fact that Appian portrays Cicero as the author of the motion; it is easier to believe that Tullus and Tullius have been confused than that Tullius (mentioned only by Appian) spoke in support of Tullus (mentioned only by Plutarch). In sum, we cannot follow HOLZAPFEL in his emendation Τύλλιος; therefore, we are forced to conclude that Plutarch and Appian attribute the same motion to different men. And we cannot escape from this contradiction by following HOLMES or LANGE.<sup>11</sup> We have established that the accounts of Plutarch and Appian cannot be reconciled. It remains to decide where the fault lies.

ED. MEYER believed that the embassy was moved by Volcaci<sup>us</sup> Tullus, and was followed in this view by M. GELZER and H. GUNDEL,<sup>12</sup> but in place of argument he simply stated that Appian confused Tullus with Tullius.<sup>13</sup> Only HOLZAPFEL, who

---

The sole authorship of motions is not mysterious, but follows from the fact that senators were questioned seriatim in the *interrogatio*. Sole authorship is also indicated by the fact that neither *auctor sententiae* nor *princeps sententiae* is ever used in the plural by Cicero; at least one of these phrases must mean «author of the motion» – according to TH. MOMMSEN, both did (Römisches Staatsrecht, Leipzig 1888, III 977–78 and 978 n. 1).

<sup>10</sup> Römische Alterthümer, Berlin 1876, III<sup>2</sup> 409.

<sup>11</sup> We could admit the possibility that Volcaci<sup>us</sup> and Cicero both delivered *sententiae* calling for an embassy, but we would also have to admit that these proposals necessarily differed in detail. In that case, both Plutarch and Appian have left us a distorted picture of the meeting – a conclusion which would hardly comfort HOLMES, who wanted to defend the essential historicity of each. The possibility that Volcaci<sup>us</sup> and Cicero both proposed an embassy can be excluded, as I think, by a close reading of Appian. In the last sentence of 2,36 and the first of 2,37, we find the following sequence of events: 1) Cicero proposed an embassy, 2) the consuls offered opposition (ἀντιπρατόντων...των ὑπᾶτων), and 3) Favonius spoke. If the consuls spoke in opposition after the first *sententia* for an embassy, it is doubtful that a second such *sententia* was delivered.

<sup>12</sup> MEYER, l. c. (n. 1) 295 and n. 5; GELZER, Pompeius, Munich 1949, 199, 279 n. 151; GUNDEL, RE 9A, 1961, 756. In a note to their Budé edition (pp. 307–08), FLACELIÈRE and CHAMBRY similarly opine that Appian was wrong. Plutarch could have changed Tullius to Tullus as easily as Appian could have changed Tullus to Tullius, but I have found no scholar who accuses Plutarch of error. FLACELIÈRE – CHAMBRY'S suggestion that the Tullus of Pomp. 60,6 need not be the consul of 66 has no likelihood at all; since Plutarch does not introduce or otherwise identify this man, we would have to believe that the Tullus concerned is the only well known or important bearer of the cognomen at the time, even if we did not know independently that the consul of 66 played a prominent role in events in 49.

<sup>13</sup> MEYER, l. c. (n. 1) 295 n. 5, also maintained that Appian conflated a meeting of 14 or 15 January (at which Volcaci<sup>us</sup> spoke) with one of 17 January (at which Pompey spoke). MEYER'S logic is faulty. We know that Cicero left Rome on 18 January (Att. 9,10,4), and we are told that Pompey left the city right after the senate meeting, and that most senators left on the following day (App. BC 2,37). Since Cicero does not mention the meeting, the occurrence of a senate meeting on 17 January is dependent on the chronological accuracy of Appian; if the chronology of Appian be deemed confused, the evidence for a meeting on the 17th disappears. MEYER made two arguments in favor of an earlier meeting on 14 or 15 January, but neither is

believed that the embassy was proposed by Cicero, has bothered to provide an argument in support of his conclusion. He admitted that Volcacijs was opposed to war in 49, but stressed that he «im ganzen doch wenig hervortrat».<sup>14</sup> Belief in Volcacijs' relative lack of importance did not prevent MEYER from attributing the motion to him.<sup>15</sup> But these judgements of the standing of Volcacijs are unduly harsh. Atticus, whose opinion Cicero respected and sought, thought very well of Volcacijs. By December 50 Atticus had already advised Cicero to assume a neutral stance like Volcacijs and Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (*cos.* 51); in a letter dated 22 February 49 he counseled Cicero to stay in Italy if M'. Lepidus (*cos.* 66) and Volcacijs stayed (Cic. Att. 7,3,3; 9,10,7). Though Cicero does not seem to have had much direct contact with Volcacijs in 49, the letters of Volcacijs were noteworthy enough to be passed on to Cicero by others (Cic. Att. 8,9A,1). And we find Cicero admitting that M'. Lepidus, Volcacijs, and Sulpicius were not less estimable than his Pompeian allies, L. Domitius and Ap. Claudius; Cicero even claims that he would join the former group, *si hos lictores molestissimos non haberem* (Att. 8,1,3). Most damaging of all to HOLZAPFEL's argument is a letter Cicero composed on 31 March (Att. 9,19,2); here Cicero expresses his hope that the decree passed by the senate under Caesar will be *in Volcacijs sententiam*.<sup>16</sup> If Cicero expected Volcacijs to deliver a *sententia* in April, no historian should deem it improbable that he delivered one in January.<sup>17</sup>

---

persuasive. He pointed out that the younger L. Caesar left Rome to see Caesar on 15 January at the latest (l. c. [n. 1] 297 n. 2), but the senate could not possibly have chosen L. Caesar as legate (SHACKLETON BAILEY, JRS 50, 1960, 82). He also tied a meeting by the 15th to the word εὐθύς in the text of Plutarch (l. c. 295 and n. 2; Plut. Pomp. 60,5: εὐθύς . . ἢ βουλῆ . . συνέτρεχον, after hearing of the capture of Ariminum). Since the capture of Ariminum became known only on the 14th (HOLZAPFEL, l. c. [n. 1] 228) or perhaps late on the 13th (MEYER, l. c. 294 n. 1), εὐθύς probably does not require a meeting before the 17th; it is well to remember that εὐθύς at Plut. Tim. 1,2 represents a period of four years (A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE, CQ 27, 1977, 178). In any event, we know that Plutarch is otherwise confused in his chronology of events surrounding this meeting. He tells us that Cato immediately (εὐθύς again) set out for Sicily following the meeting (Pomp. 61,2), but we know that Cato was still in Capua on 25 January, and at that time refused to proceed to his province (Cic. Att. 7,15,2). On the other hand, Appian's report that both consuls left the city with Pompey (BC 2,37) is contradicted by Caesar's statement that Pompey left the city the day before Lentulus and Marcellus (BC 1,14,3). For our purposes here the number and date of the meetings does not matter; for us it is enough to note that both Plutarch and Appian make chronological mistakes, and therefore one cannot adduce chronology as a ground for preferring one to the other.

<sup>14</sup> L. c. (n. 1) 229 n. 1.

<sup>15</sup> L. c. (n. 1) 295, where Volcacijs is described as «ein friedliebender Mann, der immer nur eine sehr bescheidene Rolle unter den Consularen gespielt hatte».

<sup>16</sup> Commentators always suppose that the *sententia* of Volcacijs was in favor of negotiations with Pompey. GUNDEL, RE 9A, 1961, 756, citing Att. 9,19,2, modifies MEYER's estimate of Volcacijs by adding «nicht ohne Geschick für eine Vermittlung».

<sup>17</sup> It will not do to argue that Volcacijs could become prominent only after the flight of

HOLZAPFEL also adduced pro Marcello 15 as proof of «Cicero's damalige Friedensbemühungen»: *nam et in hoc ordine integra re multa de pace dixi et in ipso bello eadem etiam cum capitis mei periculo sensi*. HOLZAPFEL argued that Cicero's speeches *in hoc ordine* could only have been delivered between 7 January and the flight from Rome on 17–18 January, since the earlier meetings were held *in urbe* (Caes. BC 1,2,1.6,1), and Cicero could not attend these on account of his imperium.<sup>18</sup> HOLZAPFEL is right about the terminus post quem, but not about the terminus ante quem. We cannot prove that Cicero spoke for peace in the senate before the flight from Rome. According to Cicero, the senate met in Capua on 25 January and decreed (*senatus decrevit*) that Postumius should relieve T. Furfanius in Sicily (Att. 7,15,2).<sup>19</sup> A Caesarian might object to Cicero's description of the meeting in Capua as a senate meeting,<sup>20</sup> but the important point is that Cicero considered it so, and that pro Marcello 15 consequently does not prove that Cicero spoke *de pace* by 17 January. One cannot save HOLZAPFEL's argument by pointing to *integra re* («while the question was under debate».)<sup>21</sup> Cicero's letter to Atticus of 26 January shows that peace initiatives were still being discussed on 25 January, and that the senators expected to discuss peace proposals again at a future meeting (Att. 7,15,2; cf. Fam. 16,12,3).

So far we have shown only that HOLZAPFEL's arguments against Volcacius and for Cicero are lacking in cogency; positive arguments against Cicero and for Volcacius remain to be stated. The ancient sources do leave us enough evidence to argue against the former and for the latter. A valuable clue left by Cicero has been overlooked. On 9 December 50 he replied to a question put by Atticus (Att. 7,3,5): *illud ipsum quod ais, «quid fiet, cum erit dictum: dic, M. Tulli?»: σύντομα, «Cn. Pompeio adsentior.» ipsum tamen Pompeium separatim ad concordiam hortabor*. We cannot be certain that Cicero on 17 January followed the policy which he had enunciated on 9 December. Yet it is significant that he had resolved not only to refrain from making a motion, but to refrain from making a speech of any kind. His plan was to urge Pompey to peace in private, and in the senate to say only «Cn. Pompeio adsentior».<sup>22</sup> We must have good reasons to attribute a speech in support of

---

Pompeian senators had reduced the size of the senate. As a long-standing consular Volcacius would have had a very high *in dicendo locus* (for the phrase, see Cic. Att. 1,13,2), and would have had a chance to speak even at the most crowded sessions of the senate.

<sup>18</sup> L. c. (n. 1) 229 n. 1.

<sup>19</sup> P. STEIN, *Die Senatssitzungen der Ciceronischen Zeit* (68–43), Münster 1930, 119, missed the meeting on 25 January; BONNEFOND-COUDRY, l. c. (n. 2) 213, considered the meeting in Capua a formal senate meeting, but inexplicably placed a query by the date 25 January.

<sup>20</sup> Cicero himself could imagine that the senators who remained in the city were passing *senatus consulta* (Att. 9,19,2), yet three days later maintained that the senators in the city did not constitute a senate, but only a *consensus senatorum* (Att. 10,1,2).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. the Budé edition (Paris 1952), where MARCEL LOB translates «quand il était temps encore».

<sup>22</sup> It is obvious that Cicero had decided against proposing a motion of his own (the usual meaning of *sententiam dicere*, as at Cic. Prov. cons. 1: *P. Servilium, qui ante me sententiam*

another's motion to Cicero in January 49, better reasons for attributing an independent motion to him, and the best reasons of all for crediting him with a motion contrary to the will of Pompey. We might also note that one of Cicero's duties in Campania was supervision of the levy (Att. 7,11,5), and we know that he had accepted this charge by 12 January (Fam. 16,11,4); it therefore seems that Cicero, right before the senate meeting under discussion, had not wavered in his plan to support Pompey in public. And as we shall see, a letter Cicero wrote in March (Att. 9,11A,2) can be interpreted as evidence that he kept to his policy and did not support peace negotiations in the senate on 17 January.

Another clue to the identity of the «Antragsteller» has been ignored. Before relating that Tullus advised the sending of ambassadors to Caesar, Plutarch tells us that Tullus asked Pompey what military forces were available. Pompey replied that he thought he could mobilize 30,000 veterans in addition to the troops which had come from Caesar.<sup>23</sup> Our Tullus then cried out, «You have completely deceived us, Pompey» («ἐξηπάτηκας ἡμᾶς ὃ Πομπήϊε,» Plut. Pomp. 60,6). This rejoinder hardly seems to suit Cicero, who publicly remained a supporter of Pompey until the battle of Pharsalus (Fam. 7,3,3), whatever the doubts he betrayed in his private correspondence. The remark fits Volcacijs very well. It may not be irrelevant that there was already talk of Pompey abandoning Italy by the 17th (Cic. Att. 7,10), for we know that Volcacijs was always strongly opposed to the idea of leaving Italy (Att. 8,9A,1). Since it is hard to believe that Cicero castigated Pompey, and since we can posit an explanation for Volcacijs' anger, we must conclude that it was Volcacijs who accused Pompey of duplicity – and therefore, Volcacijs who proposed the embassy.<sup>24</sup>

When we place the angry rejoinder of the Antragsteller beside Cicero's plan merely to assent to Pompey's motions, we have an even stronger case that Volcacijs was the author of the proposal. From this conclusion we shall be moved only by strong evidence in favor of Cicero's authorship. HOLZAPFEL thought he had found such evidence. In a letter to Caesar, probably composed on 19 March 49, Cicero

---

*dixit*). If HOLZAPFEL saw our passage he might argue that Cicero could still have given a lengthy speech in favor of Pompey (*sententia* as it is used by Caelius ap. Cic. Fam. 8,11,2: *tantum voluntatem ostenderunt pro sententia*). But *adsentior* has a highly specific meaning in a senatorial context; Cicero did not mean that he would give a speech in agreement with Pompey, but that he would merely state his agreement with Pompey (*verbo adsentiri*). This would have to be our conclusion even if Cicero had not added σύντομα, a redundancy which redoubles the proof.

<sup>23</sup> On this point, at least, the account of Plutarch must be accurate, since the same figure is found at Cic. Att. 9,6,3.

<sup>24</sup> I am aware of the argument of W. V. HARRIS, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome*, Oxford 1979, 7, 255, that «what was said in the senate... was often screened from the outside world». But I am persuaded that these particular *ipsissima verba* were remembered precisely because they were memorable.

declared: *et illi* (sc. *Pompeio*) *semper et senatui cum primum potui pacis auctor fui* (Att. 9,11A,2). HOLZAPFEL took *cum primum potui* to mean «sobald ich die Sitzungen besuchen konnte,» and this interpretation has a certain plausibility.<sup>25</sup> But in the same letter Cicero speaks of the *maxima beneficia* he had received from Pompey, and asks Caesar for the opportunity to show himself *gratum...in Pompeium* (Att. 9,11A,3). Cicero's fealty to Pompey should be kept in mind. It is possible that *cum primum potui* means Cicero became a supporter of peace as soon as Pompey did; the senate meeting concerned may be that on 25 January in Capua, before which Pompey and the consuls had composed a reply to the terms offered by Caesar (Cic. Att. 7,14,1. 16,1). Read in this light, the letter to Caesar in March 49 confirms that Cicero followed the course which he had announced to Atticus in the letter of December 50. Then he said that he would urge Pompey to peace in private (*Pompeium separatim...hortabor*), but in public support his war preparations («*Cn. Pompeio adsentior*»). Now he reveals that he privately urged Pompey to peace always (*illi semper*), but he did not always support the cause of peace in the senate (*senatui cum primum potui*). In fact, if *cum primum potui* has the meaning HOLZAPFEL gives it, Cicero has made a most undiplomatic mistake: he is then reminding Caesar that he might have attended the session on 7 January, which passed the SCU against Caesar,<sup>26</sup> but instead had placed his opportunity to triumph before the protection of Caesar's interests. This in a letter in which Cicero is trying to convince Caesar that he both was and is *amicissimus* to him (9,11A,2).

Yet even if HOLZAPFEL is right about the meaning of *cum primum potui*, the letter cannot constitute evidence that Cicero proposed the embassy unless this is what *pacis auctor* signifies. Cicero uses the phrase twelve times, twice in the plural and ten times in the singular.<sup>27</sup> In nine of the passages no reference is made to the senate. The senate is mentioned in one passage (Phil. 14,20), and oblique reference may be made to the senate in another (Fam. 7,3,2), but these passages also mention Pompey or refer to activities outside the senate, so a connection between the phrase *pacis auctor* and the senate is not established. Only in ad Atticum 9,11A,2 can we be certain that *pacis auctor* is in some way related to the senate, but even here it is not established that the phrase refers to authorship of a motion. The one occasion on which Cicero

<sup>25</sup> L. c. (n. 1) 229 n. 1. SHACKLETON BAILEY, Cicero's Letters to Atticus, Cambridge 1965–70, also took *cum primum potui* to imply that Cicero attended the senate near the city in January, «despite Pompey's advice» (Att. 7,4,2). It is clear that Pompey's admonition included meetings held *extra urbem*, which Cicero could attend without losing his chance to triumph; Cicero tells us that Pompey urged him to stay away *ne dicendis sententiis aliquem tribunum alienarem*. But the tribunes M. Antonius and Q. Cassius left Rome before the meetings held outside the city took place (Caes. BC 1,5–6), so Cicero could attend the senate on 17 January without appearing to have ignored the advice of Pompey.

<sup>26</sup> He was *ad urbem* on 4 January (Fam. 16,11,2).

<sup>27</sup> In the plural: Marcell. 15 (bis). In the singular: Lig. 28; Deiot. 29; Phil. 2,24; 7,7 and 8; 14,20; Att. 9,11A,2; Fam. 7,3,2 and 23,2; 10,6,1.



applies the phrase to someone other than himself is instructive. The proconsul L. Munatius Plancus was termed *pacis auctor* because he advocated peace in *litterae* sent to the senate (Fam. 10,6,1); if a man in Transalpine Gaul could be *pacis auctor*, we cannot take the phrase as evidence of authorship of a motion.<sup>28</sup>

Since the accounts of Plutarch and Appian cannot be reconciled, we must make a choice. All the evidence points toward the conclusion that Volcacijs is the Antragssteller we have been seeking. In their accounts of this senate meeting, Plutarch must be judged more accurate than Appian in recording names. Volcacijs and Cicero both emerge with enhanced reputations for decisiveness; Cicero, because he did not waver from his determination to support Pompey in public; Volcacijs, because his leading role in the peace bloc came earlier and was more forceful than Appian knew. Cicero should be removed from BONNEFOND-COUDRY'S list of «intervenants» at this senate meeting.<sup>29</sup>

*Department of Classics*  
*University of the Witwatersrand*  
*Wits, 2050*  
*South Africa*

---

<sup>28</sup> Citing two passages of Livy (2,16,3; 30,42,12), J. HELLEGOUARC'H, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république*, Paris 1963, 322, concluded that *auctor pacis* meant «partisan de la paix». The phrase has no more definite meaning in Cicero.

<sup>29</sup> L. c. (n. 2) 629. On the participation of Favonius in this same meeting, see: *The Praetorship of Favonius*, AJP 115, 1994 (forthcoming).