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ABSTRACT

At the end of the first book of Cicero's *De Divinatione*, Quintus remarks that, even though he believes in divination, there are some diviners whom he would not trust to give accurate predictions. These comments are followed by a quotation from Ennius' *Telamo*. Most modern scholars have assumed, therefore, that the previous lines also contain an echo, if not a paraphrase of Ennius' work. This supposition does not seem to be supported by the language or style employed by Cicero. The lines should rather be understood as embodying the parochial view that elite Romans had towards forms of divination that were foreign, rustic or mercenary and not practised by the Roman state.

At the end of the first book of *De Divinatione* (1.132), Quintus completes his argument in favour of divination by denying the respectability of certain kinds of diviners:

Nunc illa testabor, non me sortilegos neque eos, qui quaestus causa hariolentur, ne psychomantia quidem, quibus Appius, amicus tuus, uti solebat, agnoscre; non habeo denique nauci Marsum augurem, non vicanos haruspices, non de circo astrologos, non Isiacos coniectores, non interpretes somniorum; non enim sunt ii aut scienitia aut arte divini.¹

The lines that follow, '(sed)² superstitiosi vates inpudentes harioli ... de his divitiis sibi deducant drachmam, reddant cetera,' are normally attributed to Ennius. Some previous commentators considered that the Ennius quotation should begin earlier, specifically from 'non habeo denique nauci.'³ In favour

² It is not clear whether the *sed* should be attributed to Ennius or Cicero.
³ J. Davies, *De Divinatione* (Cambridge 1730); G.H. Moser, *De Divinatione* (Frankfurt 1828); A.O.L. Giese, *De Divinatione. De Fato* (Leipzig, 1829). Also R. & H. Stephanus, *Fragmenta*
of this argument the term ‘naucum’ appears to be un-Ciceronian and was used by Ennius.4 The difficulties of treating this as a direct quote from Ennius were indicated by Pease, who remarked on the metrical harshness of the language5 and the possibility that the lines were fitted rather for argumentative prose.6 Pease suggested further that ‘Isiacos coniectores’ were not demonstrably present at Rome in the early 2nd century BC, a view later contested by Salem.7 Pease did concede, however, that the passage may ‘contain reminiscences of Ennius.’ This is typically the approach taken by modern scholars who have accepted that the quotation begins later at ‘sed’ or ‘superstitiosi’, but believe that the preceding lines convey the sense of the tragic speech.8

Jocelyn, however, argued that the quotation from Ennius repeats much of the substance of the previous lines. He suggests that ‘non ... scientia aut arte’ is paraphrased in ‘inertes’; ‘superstitiosi’ by ‘insani’; ‘impudentes’ by ‘quibus egestas imperat.’9 It seems unlikely that the tragic hero, Telamo, would have paraphrased much of his own speech. Jocelyn, however, does not discuss how, exactly, the lines from ‘non habeo denique nauci’ should be treated. This paper argues that these lines are essentially Ciceronian in character - although he draws on archaisms - and that the rustic and foreign imagery of the passage are deployed to emphasise the parochial view of the Roman upper classes towards certain categories of diviners and divination.

II

There are various difficulties with the scansion of the lines ‘non habeo ... interpretes somniorum.’ There is no convenient breakdown of these lines into the trochaic tetrameter of the passage of Ennius quoted by Cicero.

---

4 For example, A.S. Pease, Cicero. De Divinatione Libri Duo (Urbana, Ill. 1920) 334-35.
5 Pease (note 4) 336.
6 Pease (note 4) 336, drawing on H.E. Allen, De Divinatione and De Fato (London 1839).
8 For example, Salem (note 7) 56-59.
Moreover, Falconer’s poetic arrangement of this section depended on an unwarranted alteration of ‘somniorum’ to ‘somnium’. In addition, I find no compelling evidence that the vocabulary points towards Ennius as the origin of this passage.

The chapter begins with a reference to types of diviners such as the ‘sortilegi’ who ‘quaestus causa hariolentur.’ Although Cicero frequently juxtaposes ‘harioli’ with other diviners, this is one of only two occasions on which the verb ‘hariolor’ appears in his extant works. There is one other reference in Ennius to ‘superstitiosis hariolationibus’ which Cicero cites earlier in De Divinatione. ‘Hariolor’ is frequently used by Plautus, along with the substantive ‘hariolus’. ‘Hariolor’ also appears in the work of Terence, who is more reticent in including references to religious material. If Cicero is borrowing material at this point, a comic source is just as likely as Ennius.

On the history of ‘naucum’ Pease stated: ‘The word is used by Plautus, Naevius and Ennius … and by Ausonius, but in the intervening classical period appears only here.’ I have found no instances of naucum in Ausonius. It is possible that this is a copy editing error for Apuleius, for the term occurs in the Apologia. Even so, a search for ‘naucum’ on the PHI Latin Texts CD-ROM reveals that ‘naucum’ appears in the treatises of grammarians prior to, during and immediately after the Ciceronian age. Grammarian interest aside, however, the term seems to have been used mainly in second-century comedy, Plautus especially. Only occasionally

---

11 Cic. Ad Att. 8.11.3.
12 Cic. De Div. 1.66.
13 Plaut. Asin. 316; 579; 924; Cist. 746; Mil. Gl. 1256; Rud. 347; 1139; 1141; Truc. 602.
14 Plaut. Amph. 1132; Cus. 356; Menaech. 76; Mil. Gl. 693; Most. 571; Poen. 791; Rud. 326; 1140.
16 See S. Montero, ‘Mántica inspirada y demonología: los harioli’, AC 42 (1993) 115-16, for a full listing of references to hariolus, hariolatio and hariolor. The terms occur 14 times in Plautus and 3 times in Terence, as well as in Naevius and Pomponius. Montero, however, believes that Cicero’s impudentesque harioli is Ennian (118).
17 Pease (note 4) 334-35.
18 Apul. Apol. 91.12.
19 Prior to: Aelius Stilo, Gramm. 19.1. During: Ateius Praetextatus, Gramm. Fr. 3; Gavius Bassus, Fr. 1. After: Cincius, Gramm. Fr. 20.
20 Plautus, Bacch. 1102; Most. 1041; Truc. 611; 1042; Par. Pig. Fr. 3. The term also occurs at Naevius, Palliatae, Fr. 105; L. Afranius, Togatae, Fr. 431.
is its use glimpsed in tragedy.\textsuperscript{21} It is possible that Cicero used ‘naucum’ to continue the archaic tone of this and the preceding chapter where he cites lines of Ennius and Pacuvius.\textsuperscript{22}

In the list of diviners, the term ‘coniector’ is found in Plautus, but never in Ennius.\textsuperscript{23} But, as we shall see, it reappears in composite lists of diviners, including one at Cicero, \textit{De Natura Deorum} 1.55.\textsuperscript{24} Although it seems to have an archaic feel, Cicero evidently felt that it was an appropriate term to use in his philosophical discourse. It recurs frequently in \textit{De Divinatione}, normally with the connotation of ‘dream interpreter.’\textsuperscript{25} But it was on the basis of the adjective ‘Isiacus’ that Pease thought this passage should belong to Cicero and not to an earlier source.\textsuperscript{26} However, Salem suggested that the influx of foreign religion in the wake of Rome’s Mediterranean conquests included worshippers of Isis.\textsuperscript{27} There is some evidence to support his view in the discovery of two inscriptions that refer to ‘sacerdotes Isidis Capitolinae’,\textsuperscript{28} and a third at Santa Maria in Aracaeli dedicated to ‘Isis Frugifera’,\textsuperscript{29} which are datable to the beginning of the 1st century BC. Another inscription from Puteoli that refers to the cult is datable to 105 BC.\textsuperscript{30} Coarelli argued that the consulship of the Paullus who destroyed the shrine of Isis and Serapis (Valerius Maximus 1.3.4) should be located in the first half of the 2nd century BC.\textsuperscript{31} The view was further supported by

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{21} Jocelyn (note 9) 152 (no. CCII, l. 375 = Fest. p. 166L: \textit{illic est nugator nilihi non nauci homo}); Curiatius, Fr. = Fest. p. 166L.
\bibitem{22} Cic. \textit{De Div.} 1.131.
\bibitem{23} Plaut. \textit{Amph.} 1128; Curr. 249; Poen. 444.
\bibitem{24} See below, p. 163.
\bibitem{25} Cic. \textit{De Div.} 1.45; 2.122 and 123 (in connection with Aesculapius and Sarapis); 2.124, 129,134, 144 and 145. At 2.62 coniector is an interpreter of portents.
\bibitem{26} Pease (note 4) 336. The next occasion that the term appears in Latin seems to be at Ov. Ep. \textit{Ex Pont.} 1.1.52; then Man. Astron. 1.918; Pliny, \textit{NH} 27.53.3; Juv. 6.489; Suet. Dom. 2.4. A search of the \textit{Thesaurus Linguae Graecae} reveals that the earliest reference to the term in Greek appears to be Jos. \textit{Ant. Jud.} 18.65.4; also at Plut. \textit{De Iside et Osiride} 352b; 352c; 382d; Disoc. Ped. \textit{De Mat. Med.} 323.5.3; Arrian, \textit{Periplus Ponti Euxinius} 20.3; 61.7; 61.8.
\bibitem{27} Salem (note 7) 56-59.
\bibitem{28} \textit{CIL} 6.2247 and 2248.
\bibitem{29} \textit{CIL} 6.351.
\bibitem{30} \textit{CIL} 10.1781. See K. Latte, \textit{Römische Religionsgeschichte} (Munich 1960) 282.
\end{thebibliography}
Takács, who suggested 182 and 168 as plausible dates for the destruction of the temple, on the grounds that Valerius’ examples otherwise all date from the 2nd century BC. But Valerius does not order his material chronologically, and there is otherwise no direct evidence which securely locates priests of Isis at Rome or even Latium in the early 2nd century BC.

The cult of Isis did, however, play an important role in the political struggle during the latter years of the Republic. In a world which seems to have welcomed a competitive atmosphere of religion, where individuals were free to choose which gods, cults or religious activity to pursue, attempts to suppress the growth in worship of Egyptian cults such as Isis (and Sarapis) were as numerous as they were unsuccessful. There were persecutions of Isis worship in 59, 58, 53, 50 and 48. Eventually the establishment appears to have capitulated, and the first temple in honour of Isis was constructed in 43 BC. Such was the popularity of the cult, that during the proscriptions of 43 and 42 BC, an aedile of the people, M. Volusius, managed to escape by disguising himself as a priest of Isis, in a robe borrowed from a friend.37 This evidence suggests more logically that Cicero is drawing here on the contemporary relevance of the Isis-worshippers. Furthermore, ‘Isiaci’ occurs only here in Republican literature, although it occurs on another three occasions in works of the Augustan or Tiberian period.38 Although Cicero

33 See D. Wardle, *Valerius Maximus. Memorable Deeds and Sayings* (Oxford 1998) 151-52, who suggests that this event is most likely to fit the context of the persecutions recorded in the 1st century BC. He would, however, amend consul to praetor to give a date of 53 BC for the destruction of the temple.
36 Dedicated by Octavian, Antony and Lepidus: Dio 47.15.4; Steinby (note 31) 3.107-09 (Coarelli).
and later authors define the term ‘coniector’ as ‘interpres somniorum’, the connection of the adjective ‘Isiacus’ with the noun ‘coniector’ (or with its Greek translation εικαστής) is otherwise unknown, either in literature or in inscriptions. Dream interpretation at the shrines of Isis is known from later periods as evidenced by inscriptions from Athens and Delos. It seems probable that in this passage Cicero was using the term ‘coniector’ as a synonym for ὄνειροκρήτης, and that usage of the phrase was prompted by the recent onslaught on the worship of Isis and a growing fervour for the Egyptian goddess which may be observed in the dedication of a temple to Isis in 43 BC, just one year after the publication of De Divinatione.

On this evidence, it seems at best unreliable to consider Ennius as a source for the lines preceding the quotation from the Telamō. In fact, there are some more overtly Ciceronian elements in this passage which suggest that we should be looking to Cicero as its ultimate source.

There is the local colour of the reference to Appius Claudius and his belief in necromancy. Cicero refers to this belief in ‘psychomantia’ again in his Tusculan Disputations. Elsewhere he mocks his friend’s belief in the divinatory value of augury, naming him a ‘Pisidian’ and a ‘Soran’. Sora lay in Latium, close to Cicero’s home town of Arpinum, and was situated close to the territory of the Marsi, whose augurs are ridiculed in this passage. Presumably, Cicero’s audience knew enough of the orator’s background and the supposed magical and divinatory abilities of the Marsi to recognise a jibe against his friend’s belief in the power of augury to predict

---

39 Fest. p. 52L: ‘interpres somniorum’; Quint. Inst. 3.6.30: ‘coniectura dicta est a coniectu, id est directione quodam rationis ad veritatem, unde etiam somniorum atque omnium interpretes coniectores vocantur.’
41 Dio 47. 15.4. Heyob (note 35) 19-20 n. 114, also sees the dedication of the temple as a political move to appease Cleopatra.
42 Cic. Tusc. Disp. 1.37: ‘animos enim per se ipsos viventes non poterant mente complecti; formam aliquam figuramque quaerebant. inde Homerī tota vēxītae; inde ea quae nous amicīs Apīlīsus vēxītumque faciebat; inde in vicīnā nostra Avenīi lucās: Unde animae excitavit obscura umbra, aperto ostio aliae Acheruntis, falsō sanguine, mortuorum sanguines.’
44 Pease (note 4) 289.
the future which contrasted with the inductive methods used by Roman augurs who specifically did not prophesy.

Linguistically, the use of ‘denique’ and the rhetorically desirable anaphora ‘non ... non ... non ... non ... non’,45 seem more suited to Cicero’s philosophical argument. The latter is employed frequently by Cicero in his law court speeches.46 Furthermore, the use of ‘interpretes somniorum’ rounds off this list of diviners with a rhythm reminiscent of a Ciceronian clausula: –ʊ –ʊ –ʊ –ʊ –ʊ , that is, a double trochee preceded by a cretic.47

Of course, the final phrase ‘non enim sunt ei aut scientia aut arte divini’ is a direct reminder of the taxonomic division of ‘divinatio’ into ‘ars’ and ‘natura’ (each with their own diviners or types of divination), a division that Cicero maintains throughout the De Divinatione.48 The finality of this statement suggests that there should be a finite caesura after ‘divini’, with the following ‘sed’ starting a new sentence, that introduces the supporting evidence from Ennius’ Telamo.

A closer look at the passage reveals that Cicero is deliberately drawing attention to the archaic, rustic and foreign nature of these diviners.

Divination by lot seems to have been a common custom amongst Italian communities.49 The ‘sortilegi’ referred to by Quintus here, therefore, should be differentiated from the officials who practised the drawing of lots

45 [Cic.] Rhet. Her. 4.19.
46 For example, Cic. In Verr. 2.1.136; De Leg. Agr. 1.26; Pro Rab. Perd. 35.7; Pro Flacc. 85.11; De Har. Resp. 56.6; Pro Balb. 58.8; Pro Planc. 62.7.
48 Cic. De Div. 1.12; 1.34; 2.26-27; 2.100; cf. 1.37; 1.70; 72; 1.110; 1.124.
in temples, or those connected with the reading of oracular lots, such as those at the Temple of Fortune at Praeneste — although, as Valerius Maximus shows, even the consultation of the lots of Fortune at Praeneste was not regarded as correct Roman practice. The practices of the 'sortilegi' are closely associated with the archaic and anile traditions of the country. It is, therefore, no surprise that the drawing of lots for the purposes of divination is mentioned as early as Plautus. But the 'sortilegi' mentioned here would have had much in common with Horace's Sabine matron who is described: 'quod ... cecinit divina mota anus urna.'

Only Cicero refers again to Marsian augurs. Like other rural Italian peoples, they had a reputation for magic and divination: Gellius refers to the Marsi as descendants of Circe and Horace to Marsian incantations and Sabine prophecies. It is possible that the Phrygian Marsyas, who is said to have given the Marsi their name, also taught the Marsi their augural ability. A coin of L. Marcus Censorinus, depicting Marsyas, shows him wearing a fillet as would be customary for a divinity, and he is referred to in a passage of Charax of Pergamon as a 'supernatural being'. The Phrygians are acknowledged by Cicero to be experts in the art of augury, and when Marsyas arrived in Italy, he gave his name to the Marsi who had a reputation for magic and divination. But perhaps most compelling is a passage of Cn. Gellius which refers to Megales, Marsyas' envoy, who taught the Sabine people the art of augury. More generally, Servius refers to the Trojans

---

50 See Isid. Orig. 8.9.28: 'sortilegi sunt qui ... per quasdam suas sanctorum sortes vocant, divinationis scientiam profitentur'. But see Pease (note 4) 333, who suggests that the 'sortilegi' mentioned by Quintus might be 'attached to a particular shrine or, more often, be mere strolling quacks.' Since the drawing of lots at temples such as Praeneste is defended by Quintus (De Div. 1.34), we should perhaps see him in this passage as referring only to Pease's 'strolling quacks' and not more formal sortilegi found at temple sanctuaries.

51 Val. Max. 1.3.2.

52 Plaut. Cas. 386.

53 Hor. Sat. 1.9.30; cf. Hor. Epod. 17.28: 'Sabella ... carmina'; Porphyry. Comm. in Hor. Serm. 1.9.29-30. Porphyry. Comm. in Hor. Serm. 1.6.114 refers to the circus diviners as 'sortilegi'.

54 Cic. De Div. 2.70.


56 Hor. Epod. 17.9, 28, 60; cf. Verg...Aen. 7.758; Ov. Ars Am. 2.102; Sil. Ital. 8.495-97 for rustic use of magic and incantations.

57 Pliny, NH 21.8.

58 Charax, Etymologicum Magnum.

59 Cic. De Div. 1.41; 2.38.

60 Cn. Gellius, apud Solinus 1.8-9.
who were sent out by King Marysas who taught the Italians the augural discipline. In other situations we learn of Sabine ‘sortilegi’ and ‘haruspices’. The archaic tone of this passage suggests that Cicero’s intent here is to contrast, in a rather patronising manner, the disreputable activities of rustic diviners with those of the respectable Roman augurs.

The rustic imagery continues with the adjective vicanicus. Again, nowhere else are there references to ‘village “haruspices”’, and the word ‘vicanicus’ is used rarely, once more in Cicero, once in Livy and twice in Festus. Like the use of ‘Marsus’, the adjective distinguishes the rural practitioners from the more renowned and respected Etruscan ‘haruspices’.

Like the Marsian augurs or the Isis interpreters, ‘circi astrologi’ are otherwise unknown — although, when Horace described his nightly habit of wandering around the Circus and forum, listening to the diviners, he described the Circus as ‘fallax’, a word later used by Valerius Maximus’ fourth-century epitomator, Julius Paris (and Tacitus), of the deceitful predictions of astrologers who made prophecies for financial reward. The word used by Valerius is ‘quaestuosa’. Juvenal confirms the presence of foreign and disreputable diviners in the districts around the Circus Maximus. Elsewhere, Quintus praises the practices of the Chaldaeans and, presumably, he did not think that Tarutius or Nigidius Figulus were ‘vicani’.

Neither ‘astrologos’ nor the multi-syllabic ‘interpretes somniorum’ scan comfortably. Moreover, the phrase ‘somniorum interpretes’ appears

---

61 Serv. Ad Ae1. 3.359: ‘non nulli autem dicunt a Marsya rege missus e Phrygia regnante Fauno, qui disciplinam auguriorum Italis ostenderunt.’
62 For a Sabine ‘sortilegus’, see Hor. Sat. 1.9.29-30; a ‘haruspex’, Trog. Hist. 38.152.93 (= Just. Epit. 38.36.7).
63 Cic. Pro Flacc. 8.2; Livy, 38.30.8; Fest. 371, 16L; 371, 18L.
64 Hor. Sat. 1.6.114.
65 Val. Max. 1.3.3; Tac. Hist. 1.22.1: ‘genus hominum potentibus infidum, sperantibus fallax, quod in civitate nostra vetabitur semper et retinebitur.’
66 Juv. Sat. 6.582-91: ‘si mediocris erit, spatium lustrabit utrimque metarum et sortes ducet frontemque manumque praebet vati crebrum poppsyma roganti divitibus responsa dabit Phryx augur et Indus conductus, dabit astrorum mundique peritum atque aliquis senior qui publica fulgura condit; plebeium in circos positum est et in aggerre fatum: quae multis longum ostendit cervicibus aurum consulit ante falsas delphinorumque columnas lan saga vendenti nubat caupone relicto.’
67 Cic. De Div. 1.91; cf. 1.36.
rarely in Latin literature and never prior to Cicero. Cicero more often employs the term ‘coniector’ to describe the person who interpreted dreams, which may suggest that he thought of the ‘Isiaci coniectores’ in a similar light to the ‘somniorum interpretes’. It is possible that, like astrologers and worshippers of Isis, dream interpreters came to Rome in the wake of her Mediterranean conquests, since dream interpretation was common in the Greek world and ancient Near East. There it was the preserve of the specially designated ἄριστοι προφῆται drawn from aristocratic families who maintained collections of dreams and their interpretations, at certain temples, and at shrines, for example, of Asclepius and Amphiaratus. But this was never the case in the Roman Republic. It is possible that dream-interpretation increased in respectability in the Empire; for example, Artemidorus naturally includes this interpreter in his list of respectable diviners. But Juvenal alluded disparagingly to the interpretation of dreams by his ‘tremulous’ Jewess. And although generals or emperors might occasionally invoke dreams to support their claims to power, dreams were never formally incorporated into the apparatus of Roman religion. It is possible that Cicero includes here the ‘interpres somniorum’ because of their eastern or foreign connection.

68 Cic. De Div. 1.39; Petr. Sat. 10.2.1; Pliny 7.203; Quint. Inst. 3.6.30; Tac. Ann. 2.27.4. Cf. Cic. De Div. 1.45 and 53; 2.127 and 131.
69 Cic. De Div. 2.123, 124, 129, 134 (three times), 144 and 145.
71 See R.G.A. van Lieshout, Greeks on Dreams (Utrecht 1980) 165-95.
72 The examples of Latinus (Livy 2.36.1-37.1; Val. Max. 1.7.4; Cic. De Div. 1.55; Dion. Hal. 7.68.3-69.2; Plut. Cor. 24.1-25.1; Macr. Sat. 1.11.3-5; Min. Fel. Oct. 7.3.27.4; Am Nat. 7.39; Lact. Inst. 2.7.20; Aug. CD 4.26, 8.13) or Caecilia Metella (Cic. De Div. 1.4; 1.99 = Sisenna Fr. 5P; 2.136; Obs. 55) are anomalies in the historical record. P. Kragelund, ‘Dreams, religion and politics in Republican Rome’, Historia 50 (2001) 53-95, argues that ‘panic is likely to have prompted official recognition’ (88) of Metella’s dream, in particular.
74 Juv. Sat. 6.546-47.
75 Kragelund (note 72) 95.
Composite lists of diviners recur frequently in prose. The earliest compilation appears in Cato the Elder: 'vilicus haruspicem, augurem, hariolum, Chaldaeum ne quern consuluisse vetuit.' Here Cato forbade his *vilicus* to consult these kinds of diviners, not because they were untrustworthy, but because they offered him access to power of which only his master should make correct and proper use.

Similar composite lists are relatively common in rhetorical or philosophical treatises: 'divinum et humanum: divinum, ut oracula, ut auspicia, ut vaticinationes, ut responsa sacerdotum, haruspicum, coniectorum, humanum ...'; 'et haruspices et fulguratores et interpretes ostentorum et augures et sortilegos et Chaldaeos?'; 'Aliter enim oraculorum, aliter haruspicum augurum coniectorum mathematicorum fides confirrnari aut refelli potest'; 'Qua tanta inbueremur superstitione si vos audire vellemus, ut haruspices augures harioli vates coniectores nobis essent colendi.'

If the pejorative identifiers are removed from *De Divinatione* 1.132, its similarity to the passages above is evident: '(non habeo denique nauci) augurem, haruspices, astrologos, coniectores, interpretes somniorum'. Cicero's craftsmanship is evidently at work here and it should be possible to discard the possibility that this passage is a quotation from Ennius.

IV

The Roman elite often adopted a particular stance towards diviners of other nations and towards diviners who made predictions for money. For example, Cicero scorns the way in which other nations practise augury, and uses the Marsi as a model: "Difficilis auguri locus ad contra dicendum." Marso fortasse, sed Romano facillimus. Non enim sumus ei nos augures, qui avium reliquorumve signorum observatione futura dicamus." Cato the Censor

---

76 Cato, *De Agr.* 5.4.4.
80 Quint. *Inst.* 5.7.36. Other lists of this kind occur: for example, Artem. *Oenir.* 2.69; Cod. Theod. 9.16.4 (4 Jan. 357); cf. Graf (note 70) 285-86.
82 Cic. *De Div.* 2.70.
also casts doubt on the divination practised by *haruspices*: ‘Vetus autem illud Catonis admodum scitum est, qui mirari se aiebat quod non rideret haruspex haruspicem cum vidisset.’ 83 In the 1st century BC, too, Sisenna disputed the reliability of dreams, to which the Roman Senate did not normally pay much attention, but he was inclined to ‘ostenta’ which are included in his *Histories*. 84 Like Cicero, he seems to adopt a narrow upper-class view towards the types of divination that might be considered acceptable and for that reason only included ‘ostenta’ (or ‘prodigia’) which were a regular, and expected, feature of Rome’s religious practice during the Republic.

With the upper classes capable of expressing such views, it is not surprising that diviners were often the object of satire, as when Plautus casts doubt on their ability to make ‘verae praedictiones’, or when Juvenal warned of the dangers of marriage. 85 Extended attacks were sometimes made on the kind of diviners that Quintus Cicero mentions at *De Divinatione* 1.132. For example, in the following extract from Plautus, the wife begs her husband for some money for her consultations:

Dicat: ‘da, mi vir, kalendis meam qui matrem munerem, 
da qui faciam condimenta, da quod dem quinquatribus, 
praecantrici, coniectrici, hariolae atque haruspicae: 
flagitiumst, si nil mittetur quae supercilio spicit ...’ 86

Plautus caricatures the activities of diviners by rendering them here in the feminine 87 and, in the case of the ‘eyebrow reader’, by parodying the operation of a physiognomist. 88 But those real-life masculine diviners, who

83 *Cic. De Div. 2.51. Cf. De Nat. Deor. 1.71*: ‘mirabile videtur quod non rideat haruspex cum haruspicem viderit.’ Pease (note 4) 439 thinks that the absence of Cato’s name here indicates that this saying had become more or less proverbial. See G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (München 1912) 547 and n. 7

84 *Cic. De Div. 1.99.*

85 For example, *Plaut. Poen. 460-67, 791-93; Amph. 323*, where *superstitiosus* is likely to be ironic, implying that *superstitiosi* did not, in fact, *vera praedicant*; *Juv. Sat.* 6.542-91.


87 ‘Praecantrix’ and ‘hariola’ only occur once more in Latin literature; see *TLL* 6.3.2535, s.v. *hariolus, hariola*; Varro, ap. *Non.* 494, 27; *TLL* 10.2.394, s.v. *praecantrix*; *LS* 1411, s.v. *praecantrix*. This extract provides the only examples of ‘coniectrix’ and ‘haruspica’. *TLL* 4.314, s.v. *coniectrix*; 6.3.2549, s.v. *haruspica.*

88 *Petr. 131*: ‘illa de sinu licium protulit varii coloris filis intortum cervicemque vinxit meam.
later might be found by the Circus Maximus or other low-class areas of the city, had one defining characteristic: ‘quaestus causa hariolentur.’

On the one occasion Ennius refers to astrologers:

Astrologorum signa in caelo quid fit observationis
cum capra aut nepa aut exoritur nomen aliquod beluatum
quod est ante pedes nemo spectat, caeli scrutantes plagas.

The passage ultimately derives from Plato’s comic portrait of the philosopher, Thales. Later Juvenal, too, showed how easily diviners and divination could be the focus of satire in his extended attack on the woman’s consultation of Jewish dream interpreters, Armenian and Commagenian ‘haruspices’, Chaldaean astrologers or Phrygian and Indian augurs.

At De Divinatione 1.132, Cicero lists different types of mantic adviser, but carefully distinguishes them from respectable diviners. The diviners in this passage have much in common with the astrologers mentioned by the epitomators of Valerius Maximus, men who provide false prophecies for the sake of monetary gain (‘quaestuosa’). He emphasises the alienness of the different types of divination and diviners: they are rustic and superstitious as in the case of the ‘sortilegi’, Marsian augurs and village haruspices, or they are foreign imports to the city of Rome: ‘psychomantia’, astrologers, priests of Isis and dream-interpreters. The use of pejorative identifiers, the majority apparently unique to this passage, emphasises the alienness of such diviners. It also delineates the difference between these ‘circus’ diviners and their more reputable counterparts. Marsian augurs are not the same as Roman augurs; ‘vicani haruspices’ not the same as Etruscan ‘haruspices’; ‘circus’ astrologers not like Nigidius Figulus, Tarutius or the

Mox turbatum sputo pulverem medio sustulit digito frontemque repugnantis signavit ... may be suggesting the activity of this diviner.

For example, see Hor. Sat. 1.6.113-14; Juv. Sat. 6.542-91.

Enn. Fr. 951 (= Cic. De Rep. 1.30). The passage seems to have come from Ennius’ Iphigenia. According to Cicero it was often cited by the jurist Sex. Aelius (cos. 198) against the studies of Gallus.

Cf. Plato, Theaet. 174A.

Juv. Sat. 6.542-81.

Cf. Pease (note 4) 332-33.

Val. Max. 1.3.3.
Chaldaeans, elsewhere praised by Quintus;\textsuperscript{95} ‘Isiaci coniectores’ not like prophets or prophecy formally recognised by the Roman state such as the oracular pronouncements of Marcius, Publicius, or, of course, the Sibyl; nor do the dreams interpreted in the circus have any significance.\textsuperscript{96} The argument presented at 1.132 sits uneasily with Quintus’ acceptance of the value of divination in various non-Roman cultures where Quintus frequently makes ‘Roman practice equivalent, or even inferior, to foreign practice.’\textsuperscript{97} However, the passage anticipates the arguments of Marcus who consistently rejects foreign forms of divination. In so doing, he suggests that what is foreign is also vulgar, lacking in the humanity and civilisation that characterises the divinatory practices of the Roman élite.\textsuperscript{98}

In this respect, Quintus defends his position in favour of divination against Velleius’ arguments that all divination is superstition: ‘qua tanta inbueremur superstitione si vos audire vellemus, ut haruspices augures harioli vates coniectores nobis essent colendi.’\textsuperscript{99} More subtly, the passage allows a glimpse into the arguments that will be used against divination by Marcus in the second part of the treatise. There is little evidence to suggest that Ennius should be regarded as the source for this passage. It seems more reasonable to suppose that Cicero adopts a style for Quintus that suits his philosophical argument in favour of divination, but which carefully distances him from a naïve belief in all types of diviners or divination.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{95} Cic. De Div. 1.91.
\item \textsuperscript{96} Contrary to those that were of significance to Greek and Roman history, Cic. De Div. 1.39-46, 48-62, 115-17.
\item \textsuperscript{98} Krostenko (note 97) 364-65.
\end{itemize}
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