

CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS



---

Me autem nomine appellabat: Avoidance of Cicero's Name in His Dialogues

Author(s): Eleanor Dickey

Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 47, No. 2 (1997), pp. 584-588

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/639698>

Accessed: 13/02/2009 10:13

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Cambridge University Press and The Classical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

himself, not an example of someone who feels neither gladness nor grief.<sup>3</sup> From the margin, it crept into the text.

The point was really seen by H. Rackham, in a note to his Loeb translation (p. 94): 'Chremes' mild interest in his new neighbour, the Self-Tormentor, is rather oddly instanced as an illustration of the neutral state of emotion intermediate between mental pleasure and pain.' Oddly enough, I think, and clumsily enough, to justify deletion.

Trinity College, Oxford

P. G. MCC. BROWN

<sup>3</sup> For the common ancient practice of referring to a literary work by quotation of its opening words, even when the work was also known by a title, see E. Nachmanson, *Der griechische Buchtitel* (Göteborg, 1941, repr. Darmstadt, 1969), pp. 37–49, E. J. Kenney, 'That Incomparable Poem the *'Ille ego'?*', *CR* NS 20 (1970), 290. Admittedly the examples there discussed are not of dramatic works, except that the opening of Ennius' *Medea* is quoted by Cicero at *De Finibus* 1.5 shortly after he has referred to the work by its title. But Greek dramatic hypotheses commonly quote the opening words of a play in addition to giving its title. Terence's prologues are so clearly separate from the dramatic action that it would (I think) be quite natural to regard line 53, rather than line 1 of the prologue, as the opening of the play. I have not found an example of the use either of the first line of the opening scene or of the first line of the prologue to refer to one of Terence's plays, so perhaps I have not hit on the right explanation; but that does not weaken my conviction that the line has been interpolated at this point in Cicero's work.

#### ME AUTEM NOMINE APPELLABAT: AVOIDANCE OF CICERO'S NAME IN HIS DIALOGUES

Cicero's dialogue *De Finibus* depicts three conversations between the author and his friends.<sup>1</sup> In the course of these conversations Cicero depicts himself as addressing his interlocutors directly, using the vocative case,<sup>2</sup> on 45 occasions;<sup>3</sup> the other characters, however, never address Cicero at all. What is the reason for this imbalance?

An obvious answer to this question might be that Cicero, who is not known for his modest, self-effacing character, simply assigned himself the biggest role in his dialogues, so that the other characters could not get a word in edgewise. Closer examination of the issue, however, suggests that other factors may be at work. Cicero's favouritism towards his own persona is most obvious in the first dialogue of the *De Finibus* (books 1 and 2), in which he speaks 70% of the time, the other two characters,

<sup>1</sup> Quotations and statistics in this paper are taken from the Oxford text of Cicero's letters and the Teubner text of his philosophical works, with the exception of the *De Legibus*, which was only available to me in a Loeb text. References and abbreviations follow the conventions of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*.

<sup>2</sup> I am using 'to address' in its technical, linguistic sense (= 'to use a word referring to the person to whom one is speaking') rather than in the general sense of 'to talk to'. For the purposes of this paper, the noun 'address' is synonymous with 'vocative' (including not only names, but also any other vocative addressed to a character in the dialogue), or what linguists refer to as 'free forms of address' (see F. Braun, *Terms of Address: Problems and Patterns of Address Usage in Various Languages and Cultures* [Berlin, 1988], pp. 11–12). Cicero's dialogues often contain addresses other than those from one character to another, such as addresses to the dedicatee of the work (e.g. 'Brute', *Fin.* 1.1), or to a philosopher or other figure not actually present (e.g. 'Epicure', *Fin.* 2.21). Such addresses are not relevant to the current discussion and are not included in any statistics given in this paper.

<sup>3</sup> 1.15, 1.25, 1.27, 2.16, 2.18, 2.20, 2.23, 2.44, 2.48, 2.51, 2.60, 2.67, 2.69, 2.74, 2.80, 2.99, 2.103, 2.107, 2.109, 2.113, 2.116, 3.8, 3.11, 3.12, 3.40, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.14, 4.19, 4.24, 4.37, 4.44, 4.50, 4.60, 4.62, 4.65, 5.4, 5.6, 5.8, 5.75, 5.76, 5.78, 5.85, 5.95.

L. Manlius Torquatus and C. Valerius Triarius, being forced to share the remaining 30%. Thirty per cent of such a lengthy work is not, however, a minuscule amount of text, and the other characters would certainly have been capable of addressing Cicero's persona had the author felt inclined to make them do so; in fact they do have time to address each other (2.21).

In the second conversation (books 3 and 4) the address imbalance is even clearer; here Cicero has assigned his own character only 57% of the words spoken, but still that character addresses the others repeatedly without ever being addressed in return. In the last dialogue, which occupies book 5, Cicero lets his own character talk only 14% of the time. Here too the three other characters, Q. Tullius Cicero, L. Tullius Cicero, and M. Pupius Piso, never address the author's character directly, although they are addressed by him on a number of occasions, and although they do address each other.<sup>4</sup>

Of course, it could be that the imbalance of direct address in the *De Finibus* is a coincidence. We are only dealing with one dialogue and a total of 52 vocative addresses. Yet in fact this 'coincidence' occurs repeatedly in the nine dialogues in which Cicero appears as a character. In the *Brutus*, for example, Cicero depicts himself as speaking 84% of the time, addressing his interlocutors 55 times,<sup>5</sup> and never being addressed by them. In the *Lucullus* he speaks 60% of the time, uses 19 direct addresses,<sup>6</sup> and is himself never addressed. In the *De Divinatione* he speaks 54% of the time, uses eight addresses,<sup>7</sup> and is never addressed. In the *Academica* he speaks 24% of the time, uses five vocatives,<sup>8</sup> and is never addressed. The *De Fato* and *De Natura Deorum* provide us with no evidence one way or the other; in the former there are no direct addresses, and in the latter Cicero is such a minor character that he naturally neither gives nor receives vocatives.

There are, however, two dialogues in which Cicero does depict himself as being addressed. One is the *Partitiones Oratoriae*, in which Cicero shows himself talking to his son, who twice addresses him as 'mi pater' (1, 140). The other is the *De Legibus*. There Cicero, his brother Quintus, and T. Pomponius Atticus hold a conversation in which Cicero speaks 78% of the time and addresses his companions 40 times.<sup>9</sup> They address him 14 times<sup>10</sup> and each other three times.<sup>11</sup> Clearly this dialogue shows that Cicero was not entirely opposed to depicting addresses to himself, but at the same time there is something strange about the addresses in the *De Legibus*. Atticus is by no means a silent character in this work; he speaks 12% of the time, as compared with Quintus' 10%, and he addresses Quintus twice, whereas Quintus only addresses him once. Yet all the addresses to Marcus Cicero are spoken by Quintus, not Atticus. Moreover, Quintus never uses his brother's name, always calling him 'frater'. The address 'frater' is by no means unrealistic; the real Cicero frequently uses it to Quintus

<sup>4</sup> 5.3, 5.6 (bis), 5.71, 5.86.

<sup>5</sup> 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 42, 74, 75, 91, 109, 119, 120, 123, 125 (bis), 126, 130, 148, 149, 152, 171, 183, 184, 187, 192, 211, 212, 219, 222, 230, 231, 232, 255, 258, 266, 270, 279, 292, 297, 300, 307, 309, 317, 324 (bis), 327, 330 (bis), 331, 332.

<sup>6</sup> 64, 66, 71, 79, 87, 89, 99, 105, 111, 122, 133, 137 (bis), 141, 144, 145 (bis), 147, 148.

<sup>7</sup> 1.10, 1.11, 2.8, 2.13, 2.100, 2.101, 2.136, 2.150.

<sup>8</sup> 1.3, 1.9, 1.11, 1.26, 1.43.

<sup>9</sup> 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 (bis), 1.8, 1.12, 1.13, 1.17, 1.18, 1.21, 1.37, 1.53, 1.57, 1.58, 1.63, 2.7, 2.9, 2.12, 2.18, 2.24, 2.34, 2.43, 2.45, 2.58 (bis), 3.1, 3.12, 3.13, 3.17, 3.19, 3.23, 3.25, 3.26 (bis), 3.29, 3.30, 3.33 (bis), 3.39, 3.47.

<sup>10</sup> 1.5, 1.18, 1.52, 1.56, 2.8, 2.11, 2.17, 2.23, 2.43, 2.69, 3.12, 3.19, 3.28, 3.34.

<sup>11</sup> 1.1 (bis), 1.3.

in his letters.<sup>12</sup> Yet it is striking that in this dialogue the character Marcus Cicero uses 'frater' to his brother only three times, all three very close together;<sup>13</sup> his other 15 addresses are all 'Quinte'.<sup>14</sup> This non-reciprocal address pattern is more a feature of the dialogue than of real life; as noted above, Marcus did use 'frater' to Quintus in his letters, and Quintus in fact used 'Marce' in letters as well (*Fam.* 16.16.1).

The anomalous addresses of the *De Legibus* have been noticed by Adams, who comments, 'It is however noticeable that Cicero refrains from putting his own *praenomen* into the mouths of the other interlocutors, no doubt because of the common delicacy which deters a man from mentioning his own most intimate name. Quintus is often made to call him *frater* . . . while on the other hand Cicero always names Quintus.'<sup>15</sup> As we have just noted, it is not actually true that Cicero always names his brother in this dialogue, but that is beside the point. The difficulty is Adams' explanation of why Cicero's own name does not appear. Adams attributes this absence to Cicero's reluctance to air his *praenomen*, but in fact it is unlikely that, had Cicero here been addressed by name, all the addresses would have been by *praenomen*. It is of course true that Quintus would have been very likely to call his brother 'Marce', as he does in his letters and as was normal for Roman brothers.<sup>16</sup> It is, however, much less clear that Atticus would have been restricted to use of the *praenomen* in address. In real life, Cicero in his letters normally addressed Atticus by his *cognomen* 'Attice' or *nomen* 'Pomponi';<sup>17</sup> although addresses from Atticus to Cicero are not preserved, it is not unreasonable to assume that they were similar to those from Cicero to Atticus. In the *De Legibus*, despite Adams' assertion that '*praenomina* are used constantly',<sup>18</sup> Atticus is addressed only eight times by his *praenomen* 'Tite',<sup>19</sup> as opposed to 14 times as 'Pomponi' or 'Attice'.<sup>20</sup> Given this pattern of address between the two men, not to mention what we know of the normal rules of usage of Roman names,<sup>21</sup> it is virtually certain that addresses from Atticus to Cicero would not all have used the *praenomen*. It is thus unlikely that such addresses would have been avoided in this dialogue out of bashfulness with regard to his own *praenomen* on the part of the author.

It seems, instead, that Cicero was avoiding mention of any part of his own name. I can offer no explanation for this reluctance, but there is considerable evidence that it existed, and the apparent exceptions to it are only apparent. Thus in his letters Cicero sometimes quotes someone else addressing him by name,<sup>22</sup> but this freedom seems to go along with the colloquial tone and non-literary genre of the letters; such quotations are not found in the dialogues.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, in the dialogues Cicero's names are sometimes used in address, but only to other characters who happen to have the same names.<sup>24</sup> (This last indicates that it was not merely his own name which Cicero avoided, but the application of that name to the character representing himself.)

<sup>12</sup> E.g. *Q. fr.* 1. 3.1, 1.4.1, 2.3.7, 2.5.5. <sup>13</sup> 3.25, 3.26 (bis).

<sup>14</sup> 1.5, 1.12, 1.18, 1.57, 1.58, 2.7, 2.9, 2.12, 2.18, 2.43, 3.12, 3.17, 3.23, 3.33, 3.39.

<sup>15</sup> J. N. Adams, 'Conventions of Naming in Cicero', *CQ* NS 28 (1978), 145–66, at p. 162.

<sup>16</sup> O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen: Studien zur römischen Namengebung* (Helsinki, 1987), pp. 255–6.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. *Att.* 3.4, 3.9.2, 3.15.7, 6.1.20, 6.2.8, 6.6.4.

<sup>18</sup> Adams (n. 15), 162.

<sup>19</sup> 1.4, 1.5, 1.37, 2.34, 2.58 (bis), 3.19, 3.33.

<sup>20</sup> 1.1, 1.3, 1.8, 1.13, 1.17, 1.21, 1.53, 1.63, 2.24, 2.45, 3.1, 3.13, 3.29, 3.30, 3.47.

<sup>21</sup> See Adams (n. 15); Salomies (n. 16); F. Jones, 'Naming in Pliny's Letters', *SO* 66 (1991), 147–70; J. G. F. Powell, 'A Note on the Use of the *Praenomen*', *CQ* NS 34 (1984), 238–9; L. Vidman, 'Die Namengebung bei Plinius dem Jüngeren', *Klio* 63 (1981), 585–95.

<sup>22</sup> E.g. *Att.* 7.1.4, 7.3.5, 7.7.7.

<sup>23</sup> Note, however, *Catil.* 1.27, where Cicero quotes the personified *patria* as calling him 'M. Tulli'. <sup>24</sup> *Part.* 1, 140, *Fin.* 5.6, *Leg.* 3.36.

So far we have seen that in his philosophical dialogues Cicero did not depict his own persona being addressed directly except by his brother and his son. That in so doing he was avoiding the use of his name, rather than address *per se*, is shown by the fact that these two relatives, who can be made (with perhaps a slight lack of verisimilitude in the case of Quintus) to use only addresses which do not contain a name, address the author's persona freely. Other evidence that Cicero was avoiding the use of his name comes from third-person (non-vocative) references in the dialogues. Since Cicero normally narrates a dialogue in the first person, it is inevitable that he will refer to himself by name less often than to the other characters: when he speaks, that fact is indicated by 'inquam', while another character needs 'inquit Brutus' *vel sim*. This fact is dictated by grammar and says nothing about Cicero's avoidance of names. But another type of third-person reference, the comments made by the characters in the course of the dialogue, proves to be more significant. It is not uncommon for one character to refer to another by name, as 'Tum Pomponius: ego vero, inquit, Brutum nihil mentiri puto' (*Brut.* 18), 'Tum Cotta "Si" inquit "liber Antiochi nostri, qui ab eo nuper ad hunc Balbum missus est, vera loquitur . . ."' (*N.D.* 1.16), 'In longum sermonem me vocas, Attice; quem tamen, nisi Quintus aliud quid nos agere mavult, suscipiam et, quoniam vacui sumus, dicam' (*Leg.* 1.13). Yet Cicero himself is never referred to in this fashion; on the rare occasions when he is referred to at all, it is with a word other than his name, as 'frater' in '. . . ut ait Scaevola de fratris mei Mario' (*Leg.* 1.1).

Six of the nine dialogues in which Cicero includes himself as a character are conversations among more than two people. In such conversations, whether on paper or in the flesh, direct addresses are not merely ornamentation: they perform a concrete function, indicating whom the speaker is talking to and making it clear when he changes interlocutors. It is undoubtedly for this reason that the six multi-person dialogues (*De Finibus*, *De Legibus*, *De Natura Deorum*, *Academica*, *Lucullus*, and *Brutus*) contain, on average, more than six times as many vocatives per page as the three two-person dialogues (*De Fato*, *Partitiones Oratoriae*, and *De Divinatione*).<sup>25</sup> This reality meant that Cicero had a problem when he suppressed all the addresses to his own persona. He solved this difficulty by using a variety of circumlocutions: 'me autem nomine appellabat' (*Luc.* 13), 'me appellabat iocans' (*Luc.* 17), 'me intuens' (*N.D.* 1.17, 2.104, *Brut.* 253, 300), 'me autem dicebat' (*Ac.* 1.2, *Fin.* 5.7), 'me autem appellabat' (*Luc.* 61), etc. That these circumlocutions were, in Cicero's mind, less ideal substitutes for a vocative is shown by the fact that they do not occur with the names of persons: 'Atticum autem appellabat', 'Brutum intuens', etc. are never found, since in these cases a vocative could be (and was) used instead.

The avoidance of his own name in dialogues seems to have been a feature of Cicero's individual style rather than general Roman practice. Varro's *Res Rusticae*, which is contemporary with Cicero's works and which also features the author as a character in his own dialogue, shows no evidence of name avoidance. The *Res Rusticae* contains relatively few vocatives (only 18 from one character to another, although there are a number from author to dedicatee), but still one of these is an address by name to Varro (3.17.4). In addition, the other characters refer to Varro by name on a number of occasions.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> The multi-person dialogues have 234 addresses over 15,987 lines of text, which works out to about 31 vocatives per 100 pages of text (using for this purpose the Loeb edition, which is more consistent in format than the Teubner). The two-person dialogues have 12 addresses over 4,840 lines, or an average of five vocatives per 100 pages of text.

<sup>26</sup> 1.4.5, 3.4.2, 3.13.1.

Greek precedents for this type of name avoidance are not easy to find. Plato does not appear as a character in his own dialogues, and when Plato depicts a character narrating a dialogue in which he participated (as Socrates narrates the *Republic*), that character has no difficulty in including addresses to himself. In fact, for reasons having nothing to do with name avoidance, the *Republic* shows a marked imbalance of address by name precisely the opposite of that found in Cicero's works: Socrates is addressed by name much more often than he uses names in address.<sup>27</sup> Xenophon's *Anabasis* belongs to a different genre, but it is nonetheless notable that Xenophon there shows himself being addressed by name seven times.<sup>28</sup> Aristotle's lost dialogues would of course be the most relevant precedent, given Cicero's specific mention of them as a model for his own work (*Att.* 13.19.4), but there is at present no way of knowing whether or not Aristotle allowed the other interlocutors to address his persona by name.

Thus it is clear that Cicero in his dialogues always adhered to a convention whereby the character representing himself could be neither addressed nor referred to by name. This convention was strong enough that Cicero was prepared to put himself to some inconvenience and use circumlocutions where he would normally have put a vocative to make the course of the conversation clear. It was apparently not, however, a convention shared by other Roman writers of the time. Given the lack of Greek parallels and the loss of crucial evidence, the origins of this convention, like its purpose, at present remain obscure.

University of Ottawa

ELEANOR DICKEY

<sup>27</sup> E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 107–9.

<sup>28</sup> 3.1.34, 3.1.45, 3.4.47, 7.1.21, 7.2.38, 7.3.47, 7.7.3.

#### THE SCANSION OF *PHARSALIA* (CATULLUS 64.37; STATIUS, *ACHILLEID* 1.152; CALPURNIUS SICULUS 4.101)

In reviewing Ellis' OCT of Catullus, Housman scorned the 'diction and metre' of *Carm.* 64.37, 'Pharsaliam coeunt, Pharsalia tecta frequentant'.<sup>1</sup> Yet several subsequent editors have agreed with Ellis and have also refrained from emending *Pharsaliam*. Even if there has not been enough discomfort with the MS reading to put some editors off retaining it, they might yet welcome a piece of positive evidence to support this decision. I will make the case that a passage in Statius' *Achilleid* may indicate that the later poet was familiar with the line as the MSS have it.

First I will treat the putative error in diction which has been half of the argument which led Mynors and Goold to adopt Pontanus' conjecture *Pharsalum coeunt*; the prosody I shall deal with below. If we retain *Pharsaliam*, we are implying that this is the name of a town, not a region.<sup>2</sup> Mynors also chose to emend, and Fordyce in his commentary ad v. says, '*Pharsalia* is nowhere else found for *Pharsalus* as the name of the town'. Both *L-S* and the *OLD* do make the distinction that *Pharsalus* was the proper name of the town and that the noun *Pharsalia* denoted only the general region

<sup>1</sup> *Classical Papers* 627 = *CR* 19 (1905), 123.

<sup>2</sup> '... as shown partly by the omission of any preposition (Kraft), partly by being combined with Crannon and Larissa, partly by the word *coeunt* which could scarcely apply to any place larger than a town'; thus Ellis ad v.