A Brief Look at Two Scholars of Cicero: Statilius Maximus from the Antonine Age and Servatus Lupus, Carolingian Scholar

A Brief Look at Two Scholars of Cicero: Statilius Maximus from the Antonine Age and Servatus Lupus, Carolingian Scholar

ABSTRACT

Cicero is one of the most widely read Latin authors in the under-grad's Latin career, yet, how he was received posthumously by early scholars is a topic often overlooked. Briefly entering the world of textual criticism, this paper looks to explore different interests in Cicero and his work by examining the work of two scholars from different periods in history. The first scholar is little-known Statilius Maximus from the Antonine period whose interest and focus on Cicero's work arises from Cicero's speeches. Statilius' work only exists in quotes from Romanus cited by Charisius in his *Ars Grammaticae Liber V*. From these citations and by comparison with two other scholars from his period, Fronto and Gellius, a focus on single words and mere compilation becomes evident. In lists called *singularia*, Statilius assembles not only lists of words from Cicero's speeches, but also argues for their definitions. Statilius' focus lies in attention to singular word detail.

The second scholar is Servatus Lupus, Abbot of Ferrieres and Carolingian scholar from the 9th century. Considered one of the first early humanists, Lupus pursues knowledge for its own sake and compiles as accurate a copy of Cicero's *de Oratore* as he is able by requesting additional texts from Einhard and others. Lupus does not neglect tiny detail in his search for content and leaves room for improvement even of his own text. Lupus' quest to preserve classical texts from antiquity for posterity indicates that he believed Cicero was well worth preserving. The work of both Statilius Maximus and Servatus Lupus preserve different aspects of Cicero's work that the test of time indicates are of value – be they details or entire works.

A Brief Look at Two Scholars of Cicero: Statilius Maximus from the Antonine Age and Servatus Lupus, Carolingian Scholar

An under-graduate student of Latin spends much time immersed in Latin texts and translations, studying ancient culture and ideas through the language itself. But there comes a time when the inquisitive student desires to know what other men did with the works of their predecessors and how the texts were valued and used. Different ages found different purposes for classical texts as is evident from what remains of their scholarship. In order to gain a bit of an understanding of how different scholars used their predecessors' texts, this paper looks to examine how a little-known Antonine scholar, Statilius Maximus, and a Carolingian scholar, Servatus Lupus, valued Cicero. The differences between Statilius' and Lupus' interests reflect the different ways in which they valued Cicero's texts and to what end they used them.

To place Statilius Maximus in a specific time frame, James Zetzel notes that the citations by Julius Romanus, an early grammarian, provide the only evidence for his date. To further narrow the time frame, Statilius is mentioned neither in Gellius nor in Suetonius' *De Grammaticis* which suggests that he worked in the latter half of the second century. Perhaps most importantly, his interest in rare words strongly supports that he was a contemporary of Fronto and Gellius - two prominent Antonines who likewise had a fascination with archaisms; it becomes useful to examine Statilius with their own context as a guide to understanding Statilius' methods and interest (Zetzel, Tironem 228; Zetzel, Statilius 107). In his book, Zetzel indicates Statilius' year was most likely A.D. 156 (Zetzel, Late Antiquity 211).

Although little is known about Statilius Maximus, several modern scholars have pieced together a history and a purpose from his fragmentary work which survives in the form of quotes

by Romanus which only survive in Charisius' *Ars Grammaticae Liber V*[i]. Statilius' connection to Cicero exists in his copying Cicero's speeches and his collection of rare archaic words compiled into lists called *singulari.* Following the work of James Zeztel, a better understanding of Statilius Maximus, Ciceronian scholarship in the Antonine age, and the value of Cicero to second century "academics" emerges.

Although even Cicero mentions the importance of the role of single words at least twice in his *De Oratore*[ii] which was certainly in circulation during the Antonine Age[iii], it seems several scholars took the importance of singular words to the extreme. Opperating under the assumption that what survives of Statilius Maximus' work is the most valued of his work, his compilation of single words and their definitions become the primary focus for discussion. Cicero writes in the *De Oratore,* "Thus it happens that every virtue and praise of single words exists in three ways: if a word be ancient, but nevertheless as custom is able to bear it" and gives a brief explanation via Crassus of the use of archaisms(Cicero, *de Ora.* 170). Archaisms ought to enhance the understanding of the content and word selection can be seen as foundational to the study of rhetoric. It is these archaisms which Statilius, Gellius, and Fronto collect in the lists (which Zetzel explains) called *singularia.* Statilius compiled lists of words from both Cicero and Cato for reference purposes. The evidence for the existence of the list *ms.* of Statilius' *singularia* comes from the subscriptions in Charisius' grammar text. Two subscriptions in particular mention *singularibus apud* (Char. 252.15; Char. 282.5). In both cases, the *singularia* come from Cicero as *apud Ciceronem* and *apud eum* ("referencing Cicero").

Gellius and Fronto were educators and scholars who deplored the state of Roman education, and, as wealthy individuals, they could afford the best texts and extensive travel. They

advised their own students to employ their spare time compiling lists of *singularia* and *synonyma*. Zetzel indicates that Statilius' lists would have been used by Gellius' less fortunate contemporaries as a ready-made learning tool. Fragments of this compilation are what exist in Charisius. Zetzel also indicates that *singularia* includes not only definitions, but rare morphological items which are present in Statilius' list. Collections, like this of Statilius, were the teaching supplements for the poor Roman who did not have the years of experience and collection of Gellius or Fronto (Zetzel, *Statilius* 109). That is not to say that the lists from Statilius were useless - on the contrary. They included overlap of the lists from Gellius and Fronto providing evidence for their value. While taking stock of Statilius' work, it becomes aparent that he was also a careful scholar comparing definitions and uses of words.

The examples to follow are taken from Romanus' chapter on adverbs as cited by Charisius in his *Artis Grammaticae*. In brief, some examples include *saepenumero*, *confestim*, *imperiose,* and adjectival forms from adverbs such as *malitiose* from Statilius appearing as *malitiosus* in both Gellius and Fronto (Zetzel, *Statilius* 112). In his examination of these subscriptions, Zetzel explains that particular words are not always directly traceable to one work of Cicero. Charisius notes one such word, *confestim*, and proceeds to quote Statilius' translation as meaning exactly what *confestim* means in its contexts in Cicero (Zetzel, *Statilius* 110). Statilius actually defines *confestim* as *ordine* and *sine intermissione* (Charisius 255.3). This subscription demonstrates that Statilius was more than a compiler of words - he also defined words as already mentioned. Another interesting example of antiquarian fascination is the word *pariter* which during the second century was not altogether uncommon and appears in both Gellius and Fronto. Zetzel explains that *pariter* appears in Cicero too often to permit identification of Statilius' source, yet, in the second century A.D., "*pariter* was less readily

understood than *pariliter*" (Zetzel, *Statilius* 112). *Pariter* is often glossed with *similiter* and is even called *antiquum* (Zetzel, *Statilius* 112). From these quotes used by Romanus and recorded by Charisius, Statilius was valued for his compilation of words. Statilius valued and was interested in Cicero's particular word usage and in preserving those words for students of rhetoric and oratory.

In the Carolingian period, however, another student of the classics arises, Servatus Lupus, perhaps more commonly known as Lupus, Abbot of Ferrieres who also shared an interest in Cicero. While several copies of Cicero's *de Oratore* survive from the Medieval Ages, Lupus' edition of it, known as Harleianus, is considered the most prominent (Winterbottom, 104). Lupus served as Abbot of the monastery of Ferrieres in modern France in 840 A.D. and is referred to as an early humanist not for his ability in profound scholarship or deep thinking, but rather from his ardent devotion to the study of the classics and his desire for posterity to know them as well(Noble, 237). Lupus valued these works in their complete form. From early in his childhood, and even from his name "Lupus" which he shared with earlier prestigious minds such as the bishops of Bayeux, Chalons, Limoges, Sens, and Troyes, Lupus seemed destined for scholarship (Noble, 233). Lupus himself recognized his early love of learning saying "*Amor litterarum ab ipso fere initio pueritiae mihi est innatus*" in one of his letters to Einhard (Levillain, 4). Lupus quickly excelled in his study of the liberal arts with an emphasis on grammar and rhetoric. His primary teacher at the monastery at Ferrieres, Aldric, played a vital role in Lupus' education and was very important to Lupus who mentions him as *dominus ac nutrioris* in *Epistulae* 7. Lupus showed such fervor in his study that Aldric sent him for further instruction at Fulda where Lupus encountered many classical and liturgical texts (Reynolds, VIII). It was here that Lupus earned his recognition as a scholar. During his time at Fulda, Lupus was able to foster a relationship

with Einhard, the biographer of Charlemagne, and gained even greater access to manuscripts through this relationship. Lupus' main interest lay in the study of written historical sources, now called philology, and, upon his return to Ferrieres in 836, took it upon himself to enrich the monastery by providing copies of precious ancient manuscripts. A large portion of the information on Lupus of Ferrieres comes from a collection of his letters with most of them from Lupus himself in his own hand. Lupus was well-read and his letters are full of quotes and references to Scripture and classical authors. He is best known as a bibliophile, scribe, and text critic. He valued a wide range of classical and ecclesiastical authors and demonstrates a knowledge of others (Regenos, VII-IX).

Lupus was a pioneer thinker of his age and we glean much insight into his perspective from his first letter to Einhard. He explains, in the ninth century, in his letter to Einhard, that those who pursue education and knowledge actually were understood as a burden to society, "*Nunc oneri sunt qui aliquid discere affectant*" (Levillain, 4). Thus men fall away from seeking higher education either because they do not receive a worthy award *(palmam dignam)* for their diligence, or because they fear an unworthy reputation *(indignam famam)* (Levillian, 4). He even goes so far as to say that learning was considered to be *otia superstitiosa vel fastidivi* by commonfolk. In *epistula* 1, Lupus makes it very clear that he is above these opinions when he says, "*Mihi satis apparet propter se ipsam appetenda sapientia.*" Lupus understands that the classics are valuable for their own sake and are a source of knowledge. Lupus is not as concerned with one method or another of learning, but instead recognizes the value of ancient content. Lupus seeks to reconstruct all of *de Oratore*, not to preserve only fragments. Lupus' interests lay in content, without necessarily one minute focus. Lupus is at the forefront of what he feels is a revival of learning which values the classics. He says to Einhard that this learning has been

revived even in his own time (*ventra memoria*) (Levillian, 3). It is as if Lupus recognizes he is breaking new ground. Part of the reason Lupus was writing to Einhard was to request a copy of *de Oratore* in order to assemble a copy of his own. He makes a rather bold request for quite a few books including the *De Rhetorica*, the *explanatio in libros Ciceronis*, and *Noctium Atticarum*. Lupus does not call the collection of three books on rhetoric the *de Oratore*, but this must be what he means because it is *in disputatione ac dialogo de oratore* - the exact format of *de Oratore*. It is evident that Einhard complied because c. 856, Lupus again requests a copy of *de Oratore* this time from Pope Benedict III with which to further complete his own saying, "*quorum [librorum] utriusque partes habemu.*" (Winterbottom, 104; Levillain, 4).

The copy of *de Oratore* that Lupus produced is still in existence. He took great care in collecting and compiling his edition by ensuring he could cross-check his copy against others. This also brings us to another interesting observance: there were multiple copies of *de Oratore* in libraries at this time. The fact that Lupus' particular copy is still extant underscores the value of his work and reinforces its role in literary history. Interestingly, the text itself shows evidence both of extreme care and of carelessness. Lupus, of course, left lacunae and the aforementioned blank parchment pages for future additions. The end of the facsimile, however, shows that the lines of the text slant at an angle that suggests copying in extreme haste (Beeson, 104- 6). Why Lupus would have seemingly rushed is unclear. The fact remains that *H* remains an important member of the *de Oratore* stemma and has, Winterbottom has already mentioned, a close accurate relationship with the archetype. Lupus' chief aim was to understand and preserve classical texts and this he achieved in his industrious copy of Cicero's *de Oratore*. The *lacunae* he left indicate that details were important to him, but in the context of the work as a whole rather than as the subject matter for vast lists like those of Statilius, Gellius and Fronto.

Cicero is one of the most widely read Latin authors in the under-grad's Latin career, yet, how he was received posthumously by scholars is a topic often overlooked or underappreciated by the under-grad student. By examining how two different scholars from two different eras viewed and valued Cicero, the modern student is able to appreciate multiple reasons to study Cicero as well as other ancient authors. Statilius Maximus was interested in and valued precision in word meaning and spent great time compiling lists of Cicero's diction. Servatus Lupus valued the preservation of Cicero's work as a whole and ensured that sequential generations would have the ability to experience Cicero for themselves. Lupus was concerned that entire content was preserved for posterity. For the modern student, these two scholars demonstrate attention to detail and diction, but also admonish the modern student to take the works of ancient authors as a whole and for the modern student to seek an understanding of the complete work.

Endnotes

[i]Charisius, Flavius Sosipater., Karl Barwick, and F. Kühnert. *Artis Grammaticae Libri V.* Lipsiae: B.G. Teubner, 1964. Print.

[ii]Cicero, M. Tullius, and David Mankin. *De Oratore: Book III.* 3.170, 3.210 Cambridge [etc.: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print.

[iii]Cicero, M. Tullius, and David Mankin. "The Text." Introduction. *De Oratore: Book III.* Cambridge [etc.: Cambridge UP, 2011. 49-50. Print.

Bibliography

Beeson, Charles H., and Marcus Tullius. Cicero. *Lupus of Ferrieres as Scribe and Text Critic; a Study of His Autograph Copy of Cicero's De Oratore,*. Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930. Print.

Charisius, Flavius Sosipater., Karl Barwick, and F. Kühnert. *Artis Grammaticae Libri V.* Lipsiae: B.G. Teubner, 1964. Print.

Ciceró, Marc Tul·li, and Augustus S. Wilkins. "Praefatio." Preface. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetorica.* Oxonii: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1988. Iii-Vi. Print.

Cicero, M. Tullius, and David Mankin. "The Text." Introduction. *De Oratore: Book III.* Cambridge [etc.: Cambridge UP, 2011. 49-50. Print.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius., and William Baxter Owen. "The Manuscripts." Introduction.*(M. Tulli Ciceronis) De Oratore Liber Primus,*. Boston: Sanborn, 1913. Xxxvii-xxviii. Print.

Gariépy, Robert J. "Lupus of Ferrières: Carolingian scribe and text critic."*Mediaeval Studies* 30.-1 (1968): 90-105.

Gariepy, Robert J. *Lupus of Ferrières and the Classics,*. Darien, CT: Monographic, 1967. Print.

Kennedy, George Alexander. *Classical Rhetoric [and] Its Christian [and] Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern times*. Chapel Hill [etc.: University of North Carolina, 1999. Print.

Lupus, and Graydon W. Regenos. *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966. Print.

Lupus, and Léon Levillain. *Correspondance,*. Paris: H. Champion, 1927: Print.

Marshall, Peter K. "The Learning of Servatus Lupus: Some Additions."*Mediaeval Studies* 41.-1 (1979): 514-523.

Merello, Margherita. "Statilio Massimo." *Studi E Richerche Dell'Istituto De Latino* 1 (1977): 113-36. Print.

Noble, Thomas F.X. "Lupus of Ferrieres in His Carolingian Context." *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History : Essays Presented to Walter Goffart.* By Alexander C. Murray and Walter A. Goffart. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1998. 12-250. Print.

Pellegrin, Elisabeth. "Les manuscrits de Loup de Ferrières." *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des chartes* 115.1 (1957): 5-31.

Renting, D. S. A. "The Manuscripts of Cicero's De Oratore: E Is a Descendant of A."*The Classical Quarterly* 46.01 (1996): 183. Print.

Reynolds, L. D. *Texts and Transmissions: A Survey of the Latin Classics.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1983. Print.

Reynolds, L. D., and Nigel Guy Wilson. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1974. Print.

Suringar, Willem H. D. *Historia Critica Scholiastarum Latinorum.* Lugduni Batavorum: Sumptibus S. Et J. Luchtmannorum Et J.C. Cyfveerii, 1834.

Stroux, Johannes. *Handschriftliche Studien Zu Cicero De Oratore.* Basel: F. Reinhardt, Universitäts-Buchdr., 1921. Print.

Trahman, C. R., David F. Bright, and Edwin S. Ramage. *Classical Texts and Their Traditions: Studies in Honor of C.R. Trahman.* Chico, CA: Scholars, 1984. Print.

"The British Library Digital Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts." *The British Library Digital Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts*. The British Library, 8 Nov. 2012. Web. 02 Dec. 2012. <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/welcome.htm>.

Winterbottom, M. "De Oratore, Orator, Brutus." *Texts and Transmissions: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. By L. D. Reynolds. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983. 102-09. Print.

Zetzel, James E. G. "Emendavi Ad Tironem." *HSCP* 77 (1973): 225-43. Print.

Zetzel, James E. G. *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*. New York: Arno, 1981. Print.

Zetzel, James EG. "On the History of Latin Scholia." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79 (1975): 335-354.

Zetzel, J. E. G. "Statilius Maximus And Ciceronian Studies In The Antonine Age."*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 21.1 (1974): 107-23. Print.